

*The*  
*Viola da Gamba*  
*Society*  
*Journal*

Volume Nine  
(2015)

# The Viola da Gamba Society of Great Britain 2015-16

## PRESIDENT

Alison Crum

## CHAIRMAN

Michael Fleming

## COMMITTEE

Elected Members: Michael Fleming, Linda Hill, Alison Kinder

Ex Officio Members: Susanne Heinrich, Stephen Pegler, Mary Iden

Co-opted Members: Alison Crum, Esha Neogy, Marilyn Pocock, Rhiannon  
Evans

## ADMINISTRATOR

Sue Challinor, 12 Macclesfield Road, Hazel Grove, Stockport SK7 6BE

Tel: 161 456 6200

[admin@vdgs.org.uk](mailto:admin@vdgs.org.uk)

## THE VIOLA DA GAMBA SOCIETY JOURNAL

General Editor: Andrew Ashbee

Editor of Volume 9 (2015):

Andrew Ashbee, 214, Malling Road, Snodland, Kent ME6 5EQ

[aa0060962@blueyonder.co.uk](mailto:aa0060962@blueyonder.co.uk)

Full details of the Society's officers and activities, and information about membership, can be obtained from the Administrator. Contributions for *The Viola da Gamba Society Journal*, which may be about any topic related to early bowed string instruments and their music, are always welcome, though potential authors are asked to contact the editor at an early stage in the preparation of their articles. Finished material should preferably be submitted by e-mail as well as in hard copy.

A style guide is available on the vdgs web-site.

# CONTENTS

Editorial	iv
ARTICLES	
David Pinto, Consort anthem, Orlando Gibbons, and musical texts	1
Andrew Ashbee, A List of Manuscripts containing Consort Music found in the <i>Thematic Index</i>	26
MUSIC REVIEWS	
Peter Holman, <i>Leipzig Church Music from the Sherard Collection</i> (Review Article)	44
Pia Pircher, Louis Couperin, The Extant Music for Wind or String Instruments	55
Letter	58
NOTES ON THE CONTRIBUTORS	59

## Abbreviations:

*GMO* *Grove Music Online*, ed. D. Root

<<http://0-www.oxfordmusiconline.com>>.

*IMCCM* *The Viola da Gamba Society Index of Manuscripts Containing Consort Music*, ed. A. Ashbee, R. Thompson

and J. Wainwright, I (Aldershot, 2001); II (Aldershot, 2008). Now online at  
<[www.vdgs.org.uk/indexmss.html](http://www.vdgs.org.uk/indexmss.html)>

*MGG2* *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, ed. L. Finscher

<<http://www.mgg-online.com>>

*ODNB* *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. L. Goldman

<[www.oxforddnb.com](http://www.oxforddnb.com)>.

*RISM* *Repertoire internationale des sources musicales*.

<[www.rism.info](http://www.rism.info)>

## EDITORIAL

Only one submission to the Journal has been received this year: David Pinto's thought-provoking article on the verse-anthem and his interpretation of the evidence as to how and where these were performed. The opportunity has therefore been taken to provide a first list of manuscripts catalogued in the Society's card index, mostly compiled by Gordon Dodd, to which are added later discoveries. This is an initial draft, since no such list has been made up to now, and I will be pleased to hear of omissions or amendments. A further version recording also the type of content (solo lyra viol; four-part consort, etc) should now be made for the Society's web-site and I will work on this. Continual developments in Internet content are difficult to keep up with, but correspondence with RISM (*Répertoire International des Sources Musicales*) was the reason why this list was undertaken. Links are provided where known to manuscripts of viol music and these will increase as RISM extends.

Peter Holman's review-article on an important publication of German music happily adds to our current work on indexing German pieces with a part or parts for viols and Pia Pircher reviews a new collection of music by Louis Couperin.

# Consort anthem, Orlando Gibbons, and musical texts

David Pinto

He answered very gravely: 'It rests on something better  
than evidence.' I opened my eyes; and he went on as  
gravely: 'Conjectural emendation.'

T.R. Glover *Cambridge Retrospect*

Verse anthem, a mid-Elizabethan innovation in Anglican church music, proved meaningful enough to retain life and develop over centuries. Its first phase, up to the reign of Charles I, was as contrapuntal as full anthem, but tended to be sober and succinct rather than magnificent or florid. In fact, just that tendency can evoke feelings of greater intimacy, since soloists declaim the verses, and texts are as often devotional as scriptural. It all somewhat presages oratorio. About a hundred and ten examples survive from the period c.1570-1630 accompanied by instrumental ensemble rather than organ, eighty-odd complete.<sup>1</sup> To describe them as 'consort anthem' grates on some, who feel these two linked components 'a contradiction in terms: the "anthem" was sung only in church, in which location the consort of viols was never used.'<sup>2</sup> Yet household sets (which incidentally almost never specify viols) can preserve verse or full anthems, uniquely at times; none of them evincing palpable distress over titling out of church.<sup>3</sup> Also, a smatter of evidence shows that English choral foundations of the time used ensemble instruments, if absence of specifics (over date, continuity, repertoire) leaves their habitual part in cathedral or chapel worship open to denial.<sup>4</sup> At stake here is proprietorship. For specialists to assert that absolutely and prescriptively, as if over altar plate

---

<sup>1</sup> This count lumps sequential parts (subsidiary verses) within single titles; some, like Michael East's published efforts, of small length. Roughly four fifths are five-part, almost all the rest in six. Including those printed, about twenty-two sources are extant, roughly a third incomplete. These findings were delivered in gistier form at the Centre for Research in the Arts, Social Sciences and Humanities, Cambridge, in 'Chains of Gold: rhetoric and performance in the verse anthem', 1st March 2013. I am obliged to its convenors in the university faculty of music for an opportunity to present them.

<sup>2</sup> Roger Bowers 'Ecclesiastical or Domestic? Criteria for identification of the Initial Destinations of William Byrd's Music to Religious Vernacular Texts'; *William Byrd A Research and Information Guide* ed. Richard Turbet (3/ Routledge; N.Y., 2012), 134-160, part of fn 17, 155. This is an article based on one first presented previously, in 2004.

<sup>3</sup> In such sources one *can* stumble across use of the term 'anthem'; see fn 57. 'Give ear O Lord' by Thomas Weelkes (see below) is one relevant rescue item: verse anthem seemingly for organ, but in a domestic source lacking extant keyboard.

<sup>4</sup> Ian Payne *The Provision and Practice of Sacred Music at Cambridge Colleges and Selected Cathedrals, c.1547-c.1646: A Comparative Study of the Archival Evidence* (Garland; N.Y., 1993); Peter Webster *The relationship between religious thought and the theory and practice of church music in England, 1603-c.1640*, PhD thesis, University of Sheffield (2001); especially Part II chapter 9 'The use of musical instruments'.

reclaimed from thieves' kitchens, risks casting classification into limbo. There it seems fated to join performance practice, social placement, even the origins of the genre, defeated by lack of evidence and procedural rigour.

The ten consort anthems by Orlando Gibbons, foremost composer in the reign of James I & VI (1603-25), are a test case: all but one unique to a single score, where most are revised and incompatible with counterparts for organ in church sources. The one exception, extant in ensemble part-sets for consort, is also in an unrevised form, and earlier. That double mismatch stymies the easy expectation of a neatly partitioned general function: verse in church, consort at home.<sup>5</sup> A path out of this fog can be found. Verse anthem as a whole has two textual traits that create a *spoor*. Firstly, no source-type is devoted solely or primarily to the form. Secondly, the two types, for home or church, diverge in significant but so far under-remarked ways, because of differing outcomes to copying procedures. Cathedral choirbooks hold orderly service music, for voices only; they have separate accompaniment, in organ-books. In contrast, domestic part-sets are haphazard farragoes—they mix in consort anthems in a different procedure. They allot vocal-instrumental pairs of like range to shared books on amalgamated lines; singers enter only when underlay is subjoined. This is a compromise: it will be shown how it lets in minor copying quirks. These form an accreted pattern betraying a now-lost previous 'consort' form: separate vocal and instrumental part-sets, by no chance closer to the cathedral model. All extant domestic sources therefore derive from a secondary stage, and offer no proof of original functional divide (or much else). Evidence is not so profuse that one can safely ignore any addition to it, whatever upheaval to conclusions it entails. Here, remarks made in the preface to an edition of consort anthems by Gibbons are expanded, to aid reappraisal.<sup>6</sup>

Does 'consort anthem', a neologism of no historic standing, define a distinct experience?<sup>7</sup> Or if evidence is short for context (and manner of performance

---

<sup>5</sup> 'Behold thou hast made my days' is the only one to have no disparity. 'Sing unto the Lord' and 'This is the record of John' differ mainly in reworking of ensemble parts accompanying voices. The reworkings lack keyboard parts; which is not to rule out any. They alter no wording but can extend musical phrases and interchange material a little or add *divisi* parts. Two of the texts pray for a monarch's safety and longevity or health. 'Do not repine, fair sun' is an eleventh found elsewhere, which is secular and without trace of keyboard but has a first section with verse-chorus structure.

<sup>6</sup> *Orlando Gibbons The Consort Anthems* ed. and reconstr. David Pinto (Fretwork Editions; Richmond, 2003) 3 volumes, edn nos. FE 23-25. A complete edition combining consort and organ versions in very full fashion is *Orlando Gibbons c.1583-1625* ed. P.C. Buck, E.H. Fellowes, A. Ramsbotham, S. Townsend Warner (Oxford University Press for the Carnegie United Kingdom Trust; London, 1925) *Tudor Church Music (TCM)* vol. 4. *Orlando Gibbons I: Verse Anthems* ed. David Wulstan (Stainer & Bell for the British Academy; London, 1964) *Early English Church Music 3 (EECM)*, also covers the *genre*, with a policy of altering pitch and time-values throughout. 'Do not repine', not in the last two editions, was edited first by Philip Brett (Stainer & Bell; London, 1961) edn no. 5491, then in *Consort Anthems* (2003); both in score with playing parts.

<sup>7</sup> Experience, not form; for consort anthem is verse anthem if *sub diversis speciebus*. The need is for unimposed distinctions.

for that matter), can grubbing out ever more arcane detail clarify much? What can textual criticism add? Musicology usually ranks it lower than advances made by stricter policing of repertoire. A relevant example is in renaissance motet, ancestor to verse anthem: one now finds evidence demanded to show function, to prove it liturgical and not devotional (therefore mere domestic). To bring down or wing outworn ahistorical assumptions in this manner is fair game. A riskier allied tendency is for specialists to create nomenclature to fill an original lack. Neater tools for *genre* or form in local contexts can, however careful, predefine by circularity aspects such as function. Is ‘consort anthem’ a case, by-passing the demonstrable to impose premises? It differs from ‘full’ and ‘verse’, the contemporary terms for a procedural or textural divide; almost self-explanatory with ‘full’. In ‘verse’ soloists sing sections; full choruses alternate. The modern novelty ‘consort anthem’, built on admittedly scarce evidence and depleted sources, creates a by-form by *medium* alone, and explicitly deems instrumental ensemble a determinant of domestic use, never church, and never combined with organ.<sup>8</sup> Once promulgated, this decree found ready assent: such as ‘the failure of even one liturgical manuscript to transmit the consort version of an anthem suggests that the organ was the preferred method of accompaniment in public worship’.<sup>9</sup> (Yet evidence to shake this typical argument *ad ignorantiam* is in the public domain.) It is a standpoint that concedes that consort versions *may* have preceded those for organ at times. While clearly not so for most by Gibbons, about a third of known consort forms are doubled by cathedral versions. For many consort forms, too, it is far more probable that their contrapuntal forms preceded reduction to keyboard, not *vice versa*. The alternative, so far unchallenged, leads to a further unadmitted and odd implication: that domestic usage from a casual lay background somehow steered clerical-liturgical practice. ‘The blessed lamb’ à5 for Good Friday by Edmund Hooper is a relevant example of both these: unlikely primary church repertoire, consort anthem to devotional verse, yet in known cathedral use. The paradox may not in itself suffice to alter how the term consort anthem is applied; but an issue needs refining. The English seventeenth century, after all, offers test-cases aplenty to hold novel terminology to account for ‘added value’.

Take ‘declamatory aire’: song that veers in procedures from recitative to arioso and dance-strains; found up to Henry Purcell or beyond (Kathleen Ferrier affectionately dubbed his ‘Mad Bess’, a *genre* extreme, ‘Bad Mess’). Well and good; but no-one *then* saw a need for the term: not even its most polished, published mid-century practitioner, Henry Lawes. Has it extra traction? Does it markedly benefit how we apprehend song-form’s development? By contrast ‘fantasia suite’, for fantasias linked to dance-forms, buckles under its own weight. Only a small sector of repertoire kept its original sequence (developed

---

<sup>8</sup> John Morehen ‘The English Consort and Verse Anthem’, *Early Music* 6/3 (1978), 381-4; a brief basis for discussion.

<sup>9</sup> Ian Woodfield *The Early History of the Viol* (Cambridge University Press; Cambridge, 1984), 221.

c.1620), in the hands of just three writers and for little more than two decades.<sup>10</sup> It scants the profuse scorings and variety of dance-forms that were invested in, for a half century before sonata impinged. In this case a term broad enough is hard to come by, owing to the plural *milioux* in which combinations flourished unfettered. ‘Suite’ is anyway an anachronism, at this early generation; not seemingly used until the 1650s. (A ‘set of lessons’ could be a composite nearer to available terminology.) Enter the term ‘consort song’. It postdates Peter Warlock, who revived the form, in a pioneering three-volume edition unmatched for forty years.<sup>11</sup> Joseph Kerman similarly did not devise it, though he first showed how accompanied song pervaded publications until then called madrigalian (William Byrd’s foremost).<sup>12</sup> He found traits of it in *Madrigals* by Gibbons (1612), which led to his most intriguing percept: attributes of verse anthem in the collection’s longest piece, ‘What is our life?’<sup>13</sup> (While a side-issue here, to credit it as a cross-form brings a pessimist blatantly free-thinking voice into a context otherwise conventionally religious, or if secular never overtly sceptical.) ‘Consort song’ is a newcomer, then, but with its uses for fairly standard combinations: one voice or on occasion two, and four instrumental lines (once only, six).<sup>14</sup> A further possibility is offered of choral refrain, but the usual result is five-part counterpoint.<sup>15</sup> From that is no big step to another hybrid term, just as handy: our ‘consort anthem’. Almost casually, though, analogy from domestic song has built in the restriction that function and locale must be unliturgical, in senses broad and narrow. Why? Precious little record

---

<sup>10</sup> Fantasia-Almaine-Galliard-Close. The exact form of its inceptor John Coprario was followed only by his pupil William Lawes and then John Jenkins. Maybe 40 years later, Matthew Locke was still innovating in his four-part fantasia ‘sets’. Scorings, continuo usages, and dance-types vary enormously as do naturally the very idiosyncratic styles of writing. I owe much to Layton Ring for his insight on a range of matters discussed here.

<sup>11</sup> *Elizabethan Songs* (Oxford University Press; London, 1926), handsomely produced, stand the test of time if superseded in scale and detail by *Consort Songs* ed. Philip Brett (1967 2/ 1974), MB 22. Even that of course is inexhaustive.

<sup>12</sup> Joseph Kerman *The Elizabethan Madrigal* (Galaxy Music Corporation; N.Y., 1961). Peter Le Huray still employed ‘part-song’ in *Music and the Reformation in England 1549-1660* (Herbert Jenkins; London, 1967 and OUP; New York, 1967).

<sup>13</sup> The verbal text of 1612 seems the earliest, unless preceded by a shorter version in IRL-Dm MS Z3.5.21 f. 126. It is held the chief of variant forms in MS anthologies by Michael Rudick ‘The Text of Raleigh’s Lyric, “What is our life?”’, *Studies in Philology* 83/1 (Winter 1986) 76-87. This mounts on it a brave case for a conventionally religious interpretation.

<sup>14</sup> Philip Brett ‘The English Consort Song, 1570-1625’, *PRM4* 88 (1961-2), 73-88, made the term normative. He attributed it to Thurston Dart, though its only contemporary use in Sir William Leighton *Teares or Lamentacions of a Sorronfull Soule* (RISM 1614<sup>7</sup>) was for part-song backed by a mixed ‘consort of six’, at times called ‘broken consort’. Gibbons *Madrigals and Mottets* ed. E.H. Fellowes rev. Thurston Dart (Stainer & Bell; London, 1964) edition no. 1660, EMS 5, has a prefatory note dated Autumn 1963 containing ‘consort song’ with reference to Kerman’s findings.

<sup>15</sup> The example with six instruments is US-NYp Drexel MSS 4180-5, Anon., ‘In paradise of late a dame began’: MB 22 no. 27. This source is one of very few to include both consort anthem and consort song, which has bearing on context and usage.



survives except the musical page. Here, Gibbons repays study. Though not often called an innovator, he was a self-conscious stylist, freely manipulating *genre* or form when it suited (and not just those; if another by-way for present purposes, his very vocal style absorbs instrumental features). His contribution to a vogue c.1610 for ‘Cries’ of City or Country gives examples of cross-form: verse anthem plus consort song. Almost uniquely he vocalised an ‘In Nomine’, imported back from an instrumental *genre*.<sup>16</sup> His work with verse-structure, sacred or secular, could let slip something of what underlies it, coming from a distinguished practitioner in a period of innovation. This textual case, then, stems from examples mainly by him that exhibit boundary conditions, with implications for context, *genre*, and style. Beyond scope for present purposes is the origin of consort song and anthem.

\* \* \*

James I of England returned once only to his native Scotland, in early 1617.<sup>17</sup> He left London with a farewell consort anthem by Gibbons fresh in his ears: Philip Brett compiled known testimony for it and its singular sequel.<sup>18</sup> ‘Great king of gods’, with chorus sections more chordal than often adding stateliness to the occasion, has the king’s Chapel Royal beseeching Jehovah to safeguard him on and after his progress.<sup>19</sup> James, no longer so robust, made it a leisurely journey but still hunted as much game as possible *en route*. His Chapel was shipped as a body to Leith, to be in place to greet him at his Edinburgh palace, Holyrood House. The bill of fare for this occasion was provided by Gibbons again, by now virtual *maestro di cappella*. ‘Do not repine, fair sun’, though akin to consort anthem, sung by a chapel choir, and to verse by one of the attendant English bishops, Joseph Hall, is a welcome ode with outright pagan touches. It begs the sun-god not to ruin this day, 16th May, by sulking at being outshone: a canny trope to ensure its aptness, come rain or shine. As in his last offering,

---

<sup>16</sup> The one uncoincidental parallel predates his birth: Christopher Tye’s *In Nomine* entitled ‘Crye’, also five-part.

<sup>17</sup> His entourage departed 14th March 1617 (N.S.) according to the diary of William Laud, later Archbishop of Canterbury. Bishops may of course have been separately corralled and despatched in advance.

<sup>18</sup> Philip Brett ‘English Music for the Scottish Progress of 1617’, *Source Materials and the Interpretation of Music A Memorial Volume for Thurston Dart* ed. Ian Bent (Stainer & Bell; London, 1981), 209-226; reprinted with an odd misprint or two in Philip Brett *William Byrd and His Contemporaries Essays and a Monograph* ed. Joseph Kerman and Davitt Moroney (University of California Press; Berkeley and Los Angeles, California and London, 2007), 78-99.

<sup>19</sup> The anonymous verse prays that the king be translated to heaven as ‘liuinge flesh’, like Enoch and Elijah. Its incipit is not pagan, *pave* Brett, but from Psalm 95:3 (AV). ‘For the LORD is a great God: and a great king aboue all Gods.’ The piece must be reckoned paraliturgical, but not a *propempticon*, since it lacks the usual attribute in that of *schetliasmos*, dismay or grief of those left. John Cosin published an almost unaltered text of it: Pinto (2003) and selective bibliography. Wordbooks adapted it for a pre-existing context, a thanksgiving for the foiling of an attempt on the king’s life. The Gunpowder Plot is likely, 5th November 1605; but it could have suited Gowrie Day, marking a purported conspiracy, 5th August 1600; voted for commemoration in England from 1603 and in Scotland from 1610. No source gives a hint of keyboard accompaniment.

Gibbons commands the medium, moves boundary posts. Ensemble is integral to both, and no mere alternative mode of performance (in which they resemble some fully liturgical anthems).

'Do not repine' is unique to a part-set copied by a Gloucester Cathedral singer, John Merro (d. 1639).<sup>20</sup> An unusual composite, its first section is for verse and chorus; like consort anthem at its most florid. A second, seemingly for unsupported voices, is closer to ballett; as Brett put it, dance-strains for revels. These two may not amount to a totality: a third section of verse survives without known setting elsewhere. Even the extant music is defective. The first section gives its second verse short of one ensemble line, as Brett saw, and rectified when editing. He passed over an instrumental ritornello twice-stated in this section, where the uppermost line, a capstone to the arch, is also missing. A four-part torso remains, but trudges along; no one could feel it full or supple enough, surely.<sup>21</sup> Now, even one lacuna entails an unsensed enigma. How or why were rests substituted for notes? The query is not trivial: analysis must allow as fully as possible for intentions as committed to the page. A copyist did not casually omit a section, since someone notated rests by working out a full and *exact* complement, a conscious substitute. The tampering cannot be spontaneous, nor can there be erroneous transfer from score to part-set.<sup>22</sup> Someone, Merro or his source, silently added rests that *should not be there*. The niggle is not omission but substitution.<sup>23</sup> After all, what mental process led to outright insertion, rather than to labelling defects in blank areas or even patching them? It is no simpleton's non-problem, since this section has another anomaly that calls for attention. Two lines repeatedly alternate clef-forms: line III has clefs C3-C4, line V clefs F3-F4.<sup>24</sup> All shifts to and fro are at verse-chorus junctures, between untexted and texted portions: but that *explains* nothing. Copyists do with good reason vary clefs for terraced or outsize ranges;

---

<sup>20</sup> Drexel 4180-5: a set with five consort anthems, including Byrd's 'Lullaby'. Andrew Ashbee 'John Merro's Manuscripts Revisited', *The Viola da Gamba Society Journal* 7 (2013) on-line, 1-19.

<sup>21</sup> Brett transcribed the extant texture (example 7.1, as reprinted 2007) to single out a falling-fourth 'x' motif developed later on. This is precisely the element needed to devise the lacking top part, added in *Consort Anthems* ed. Pinto (2003).

<sup>22</sup> For a copyist's eye to wander throughout a whole verse and produce continuous rests from another stave in a score-system would be an epic fit of abstraction. It anyway cannot apply here; *no* other voice is at rest, in either section.

<sup>23</sup> Put another way, the copyist has done either too much, or else not enough. A counterexample is in a contemporary score-volume, GB-Lbl Egerton MS 3665, probably copied by Francis Tregian the younger. He did not insert rests when he met a lacuna in Thomas Morley 'Mi sfidate, guerriera' (unique to this source, line II; not the only such defect, but the only one he spotted). He began with a continuation fragment. On sensing that it could not be an incipit, he left it *in situ* and accurately posted what followed against the rest of the texture, clearly after scoring that around it. Most notably, he did not fill the intervening space with rests, but left it blank: good practice in a score, if a lacuna has attracted attention. But Merro gives rests added *in a part*, where defects stay unobvious unless marked somehow.

<sup>24</sup> If clef-alternation were intended to demarcate vocal areas it would be uniform throughout the five parts, not just two. (Here clefs are named by a lowest stave-line 1, and highest 5: C3 being 'viola' clef, normative for modern tenor viol.)

but no such case applies here.<sup>25</sup> Aperiodic alternation is cumbersome and uncalled-for, in any era. It forces instruments to adjust mental register throughout a piece, back and forth; for that matter voices too, equally spasmodically, since they are forced to follow the notated line in order to enter aright. Who went out of their way to create these extra pitfalls, and why? Can it be deliberate?

Only one unitary explanation makes full sense of both quirks. It begins in a truism. Verse anthem by nature has verses, allotted to soloists. In all of them, all choirbooks methodically notate rests in silent voices, in full, to enable time-keeping (also sectional bar-divisions, and often verbal cues, for good measure). The key is to realise that for consort anthems two complementary sets of parts must have existed, made out specifically for *performance*.<sup>26</sup> In the separate set for voices, choirbook norms prevailed: ‘tacet’ sections were given, notated by rests in full. The set for accompanists had continuous lines that did not and could not notate vocal rests: beyond capacity and purpose, as much as in any single organ part.<sup>27</sup> The surviving circulated text, assumed basic hitherto, was a later resort. To create it, part-pairs were side by side *merged into single partbooks and sets*. In these a continuous musical texture subsumed verbal text, routinely suppressing the now-functionless vocal ‘tacet’ sections. The proof is simple: the transformation into single part-sets gave room for exactly the unusual types of error encountered, that *only this process* could have produced. Parts were being recast, not recopied: focus shifted to emphasise a double duty for a new class of users, using any means at hand for economy of effort. In the blending process, pressure on time curtailed procedures. In reconciling part-pairs, renotating clefs for consistency took low priority.<sup>28</sup> A more casual effect was

---

<sup>25</sup> Robert Dow’s partbooks, GB-Och Mus 984-8, can alter clef briefly to avoid leger lines. Merro himself copied repertoire needing continual clef-change, a section for viola bastarda or like division instruments: GB-Ob MS Mus. Sch. D.246, 245-253. In John Jenkins, *Fantasia à 6* no. 12, the one extant copy for line I, GB-Och Mus 423, shifts clef to G2 after an initial stave in C1, simply so as to avoid two leger lines for a single low note (a).

<sup>26</sup> Of relevance to this argument, choirbooks were habitually duplicated in parallel sets for Decani and Cantoris sides of a choir facing across the chancel. Complementary parts were thus no innovation but a familiar copying process or ‘form’.

<sup>27</sup> Norms of practice assumed for consort rule out a keyboard part, but present absence is far from sure-fire proof. In GB-Och Mus 67, a keyboard book part-copied by Thomas Myriell and part-matching the set Mus 61-66, he tabled ‘Songs for vials & organ, in the great bookes’ (*viz* not 67 itself, where parts for named pieces are absent, but *Tristitia Remedium*), by William Daman, Alfonso Ferrabosco I, Thomas Lupo, Luca Marenzio. It is unclear if this implies that organ accompanied viols and singers. Mus 67 retains parts for ‘The Cry’ (of London) by Gibbons, and two consort anthems: John Ward, ‘Let god arise’ (which 61-66 give at two pitches, a 4th apart), and [John] Bennett, ‘O god of gods’. Craig Monson *Voices and Viols in England, 1600-1650 The Sources and the Music* (UMI Press; Ann Arbor, 1982) pl. 2c (p. 14) reproduces a section of the ‘Cry’; the part is a reduction, curiously incomplete, on a single six-line keyboard bass stave. See also fn 44.

<sup>28</sup> Consciously or not, an available vocal part-line will have been treated first, to avoid a second stage of fitting underlay that would need to apply a different mental process of combination-checking. Loss of whole instrumental sections then, small interjections even, was a *propensity*

inadvertence: the eye overlooked entire instrumental verse-sections by fixating on the vocal book of a part-pair. (Two partbooks were scanned simultaneously since sequential, incremental copying was felt inefficient use of time.) The hand then copied inapplicable rests. Next, a check for integrity of copy was not always rigorous; in this production line, attention moved on smartly, to another pair of parts. Quite apart from these failings in copy, common sense must have regard to practicalities. No performer can have tolerated the increased risk of malfunction created by hobbling instrumentalists and singers together, cramped over amalgamated parts. This should never have been assumed a professional standard. ‘Do not repine’ was, after all, performed, if any verse piece ever was. So was other work for the Chapel, self-evidently: one cannot believe Gibbons unique there. Undeniably consort anthems were printed in amalgamated style (which can be regarded as a publishing ‘form’) for the domestic market, but instances are few: William Byrd in *Songs of sundrie natures* (1589) and *Psalmes, Songs, and Sonnets* (1611); Jacobean successors were Richard Alison’s *An Howres Recreation in Musicke* (1606), for a ‘thankesgiuinge’, and notably John Amner’s *Sacred Hymnes. Of 3. 4. 5 and 6. Parts for Voyces & Vjols* (1615) with three ‘motects’ or ‘alleluias’ à6.<sup>29</sup> It is easy to see the imperative that made amalgamated forms normative in manuscript or print, ousting any arrangement for bulkier double sets. If these last had existed, though, how can they have vanished without leaving a single trace?

The answer seems to be, very easily. Merro alone, in only one piece, is skimpy evidence for original notation in consort anthem; but patterns of error in other partbook sets parallel and extend the categories of defect. Six books entitled *Tristitia Remedium* (1616) are a prime source for consort anthem, if as usual in anthology form that mixes secular and sacred (full anthem, too).<sup>30</sup> Their copyist-compiler Thomas Myriell took pains seldom matched elsewhere. That, like his fine hand, exhibits a standard of best practice. There is, then, strong evidential value in two anomalies in his unique copy of John Mundy’s ‘Sing joyfully’ à5.<sup>31</sup> Line II alternates clefs C2-C3 at all verse-chorus borders; just as in Merro.<sup>32</sup> The second is that when the one soloist (bass) rests in the verses,

---

among types of error: it would have been to lose vocal underlay, had instrumental parts been preferred.

<sup>29</sup> Martin Peerson is later, smaller-scale. Amner called first parts of his Christmas consort anthems ‘A Motect’, succeeding parts ‘An Alleluia’. ‘My Lord is hence removed’ for Easter is just ‘An Alleluia’, a shorter piece in one section. All terminate in alleluia, and none with ‘Amen’ or anything else church-fashion. His five-part consort anthems are only in manuscript.

<sup>30</sup> GB-Lbl Additional MSS 29372-7; wholly manuscript but for engraved title-pages all with title and date, as if published.

<sup>31</sup> Psalm 81: 1-4. The bass soloist, line V (Bassus partbook 29375) in clef F4, doubles chorus bass in the same partbook. The other parts are copied in an array and clefs much as normal: I-IV, books -72, -76, -73, -74, clefs G2 C2-C3 C3 C4. Editions have been in *TCM* second series (octavo) since 1937, since revised.

<sup>32</sup> Quintus partbook (29376), original pp. 200-202. In other parts of this anthem a freight of inaccurate notes suggests some clef-adjustment from dual parts, leaving traces of the unenviably-placed copyist’s struggles; such as misplacement to an adjacent line or space.

chord-fundamentals take leave of absence too; uncouth harmonic inversions open.<sup>33</sup> In other words, an ensemble bass is missing entire, and Myriell did not spot it. Compare his handling of ‘Sing unto God’ and ‘Thou art my king’ by Thomas Tomkins, both in essence five-part. He labelled them six-part because he included complementary vocal and ensemble basses.<sup>34</sup> (A slight procedural variation between these for notating soloist against chorus shows that he was not an amalgamator of texts, but diligently followed copy.<sup>35</sup>) He consigned Mundy to the five-part section under a rubric to match; all for the lack of an essential semi-independent ensemble bass. It seems then that contemporary practice did retain dual parts if needed; unless overlooked, with resultant grief.<sup>36</sup> A final instance of lacuna is ‘See, see, the word is incarnate’, the sole consort anthem by Gibbons in domestic books. It is in Myriell and the one other set to exceed his in bulk, where it is a fourth lower.<sup>37</sup> Otherwise the two accord, even over a defect. In the third verse an instrumental line, present at first, lapses after six breves.<sup>38</sup> Regardless of copyists’ standards, to find the same gap plugged by identical rests in two copying-bouts at different pitches

---

Another sort is for adjacent lines to read exactly the same notes, which could suggest intervening resort to a score-form: IV-V bars 78-79 (maybe also bar 92).

<sup>33</sup> Extant line V begins with a vacant 3½ bars (breves) in the introductory portion *before* the soloist enters; similarly verse 2 for nearly 2 bars (20-1), verse 3 (bars 34-5, 37-8), verse 5 (bars 72-3) and possibly verse 6 bar 92.

<sup>34</sup> In both works ensemble bass when divergent from bass solo voice gives essential connective tissue. ‘Sing unto god’: bars 18-23, bass solo doubled by ensemble line IV: ensemble V, tacet at first, adds pedal notes beneath. Bars 41- 44, ensemble IV doubles bass; ensemble bass adds nothing. Bars 51-2, bass voice is lower; 62-3. 86-9, 96-7, the two alternate as *bx*. Bars 98-9, soloist joins III while ensemble bass is absent; 100, interjection by ensemble bass alone. In both pieces, the ensemble bass recoils to the octave above when the voice sings low D: that may reflect on instrumentation. The treatment of *basso seguente* suggests that both consort textures are adapted from keyboard originals. See *Thomas Tomkins Five Consort Anthems* ed. David Pinto and Ross W. Duffin (Fretwork Editions; London and Bermuda, 1994) FE 10. ‘Rejoice and sing’ by Tomkins affords another instance of consort anthem in Merro defective by a whole part and more. The absence led cataloguers to call this *unicum* five-part, not six-part. It also needs extra *divisi* forces in its final full chorus. Astoundingly for the post-Reformation period, it ends by repeatedly invoking ‘Blessed Virgin Mary’: this is no Anglican domestic piety in origin.

<sup>35</sup> ‘Sing unto God’: both ensemble and bass solo parts take on underlay in chorus sections to become the ‘full’ voice. ‘Thou art my king’: again the ensemble part has underlay for chorus sections, but the bass solo has fully-notated rests.

<sup>36</sup> The part for Mundy may have been discarded for this reason of assumed obsolescence; implying shift in practical usage. Other possibilities relate to typical loss of bass parts in especial from a set; from the outside of a roll, or end of stack.

<sup>37</sup> GB-Och Mus 56-60, a set with a sacred-secular ratio roughly 3:1. The only reuse of this text was by the Hatton domestic, George Jeffreys: GB-Lbl Add. MS 10338, GB-Lcm MS 920.

<sup>38</sup> A mere semibreve rest precedes the 16-bar lacuna, but space enough for the eye to wander. Scoring is uncommon: a wordless part (atypically static) descants above the texted three. The verse is begun by a fifth part (ensemble Altus; bars 55-9), but that exits after dovetailing with the vocal bass entry over three consecutive minims, bars 58-9.

beggars belief as coincidence. The only explanation is of a common source. A stock copy (whether in score or parts), kept for commissions, had a latent fault due to a previous amalgamation process. In making it the primary combiner's eye had wandered; here, in mid-section.<sup>39</sup> The sole other source is intact. It is the revised version in score; but this verse stayed unaltered.<sup>40</sup> In any case, withdrawing the one instrumental strand leaves the partbook version too thin for purpose. (Still, comparing the prelude to 'Do not repine', one wonders if a lack would have been sensed without source-authority.)

In Myriell, clef-alternation occurs only in verse anthem, not in full, and so not at random.<sup>41</sup> Search confirms only one other real parallel, Martin Peerson's six-part setting 'O that my ways' (second part 'I will thank thee'): in this two lines alternate clefs as before.<sup>42</sup> 'Give ear O Lord' by Thomas Weelkes falls in a class apart. One voice is affected, once only, and to a different end. Altus shifts *tessitura* in verse 2 from clef C3 to C2, to partner Cantus in a duet, but returns to C3 from the very next chorus until the end. This sort of sleight, inserting a sixth line for *divisi* parts into an otherwise five-part piece, is an uncommon tactic in contrapuntal consort anthem. In fact this piece, alone in Myriell, is not even for consort. All lines are purely vocal and totally lack ensemble infill; they have full rests in the verses as if taken direct from choirbooks.<sup>43</sup> Myriell surely did not waste efforts to bring such a large, extended work to an unperformable state. It implies a completing organ-book for his set; but with no other evidence for an incomplete set, the case is dormant. Editions to date have conducted a *sub rosa* wedding on disparate source-types—the unique vocal text from a consort anthem source, quietly allied to the sole extant but unconnected organ-part, and no eyelid batted.<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>39</sup> This extends slightly a category of error, in failing to transmit a full text (or texture): loss of a portion of a part-line *within* a section, not a whole part-line for a whole section. The incipit of 'Doe not repine' may count less as part of a section, than as an introductory stanza before the voice enters—a discrete ensemble introduction.

<sup>40</sup> GB-Och Mus 21, in score. This particular verse is otherwise identical. *TCM*'s comment on the passage in the Cantus lines from this point on, 'Ch.Ch. 21 only, to end of verse', rather opaquely detracts attention from a deficit in the other sources.

<sup>41</sup> Some partbooks could by nature be more liable than others; such as Sextus, home to varied clefs for anomalous parts. None of eighteen consort anthems in Myriell's other fragmentary single book, GB-Lbl Additional MS 29427, is affected.

<sup>42</sup> Sextus (29377) has C3 for vocal sections (all choruses), C4 for ensemble in verses; Quintus (29376) clefs C1-C3 similarly.

<sup>43</sup> Verse 2 in the Altus even ends by placing before the usual bar-line a colon; a sign found throughout choirbooks (and also, *inter alia*, all three of Byrd's surreptitiously printed Latin masses), but atypical of consort anthem copies.

<sup>44</sup> *Thomas Weelkes Collected Anthems* ed. David Brown, Walter Collins and Peter Le Huray (Stainer & Bell; London, 1966 2/ 1975) MB 23: *The Treasury of English Church Music Volume Two 1545-1650* ed. Peter Le Huray (Blandford Press; London, 1965). The extant part is in GB-Ob MS Tenbury 791, the so-called Batten Organ-book, which is immethodically grouped. Monson (1982), 298 fn 12 noted the lack of accompaniment in Myriell. For his possible but non-extant organ part, see fn 27.

Nothing yet weakens the case for amalgamation from paired part-sets for voices and instruments. Even a unique instance of clef-alternation would validate it, because complementary partbook pairs will have tended to use common clefs in consort anthem, leaving no hint of a merging process. Various other detail in the unique score for consort anthems by Gibbons may confirm pre-existing dual part-sets. ‘Oh all true faithful hearts’, again paraliturgical for the Chapel Royal (for the king’s recovery from sickness), parallels ‘Great king of gods’ in simpler chordal style. Its ensemble bass hardly diverges from vocal, except fleetingly in one bar (76) where the two lines share one stave; unnormative in actual partbooks.<sup>45</sup> ‘Sing unto the Lord’ in the revised consort version has notational shorthand of linked sort. In an initial verse duet for bass voices, ensemble bass is not given its own line in score: just a few notes, passed from one vocal stave to the other.<sup>46</sup> ‘We praise thee O father’ is the most striking case of an instrumental complement gone missing. Only in its second verse (bars 26-44) are a full five parts scored in; they are wholly absent otherwise, except that fully-notated rests represent them in the first verse (1-13).<sup>47</sup> A later verse even lacks any form of *basso seguente* (56-72).<sup>48</sup> This not-quite total absence makes the case for faulty transmission into score from dual part-sets quite plain. The two sets were necessarily separate (whether loose parts or partbooks). For this piece the vocal set survived, the instrumental left barer traces.<sup>49</sup>

Still, a vast problem looms. Not one playing set of deduced sort survives; collateral evidence that any existed is meagre. Yet textual evidence is paramount. Deductions from it are uncontroversial, since extant parts (whether labelled ecclesiastical or secular, in intact sets or not), and indications from within them, are our sole evidence, until supplemented in ways yet to be proposed. Only one possible, novel and dismaying conclusion is open: we have lost touch to *wellnigh absolute degree* with consort anthem’s primary mode of

---

<sup>45</sup> There are instances in GB-Ob MSS Mus. Sch. D.212-16, E.381: ‘Above the stars’ by Thomas Tomkins and ‘O Lord consider my distress’ by Edward Smith. Richard Nicholson of Magdalen College, Oxford compiled this portion of the set for use in weekly meetings at the University Music School during his tenure of the music professorship. These and other like contents differ markedly from versions in cathedral sources close to their composers. They seem to be his arrangements especially to accommodate two chorister assistants at his meetings: hence *divisi* notation (and clef-change, in Tomkins).

<sup>46</sup> That is, they are slipped in while each solo voice is resting. The omissions do in fact lead to ambiguity in deciding how best to make a summation for a full instrumental bass line. This and the last case seem to show a copyist combining from pre-existent parts into a score pre-ruled in systems of five staves, and economising to save adding temporary sixth.

<sup>47</sup> The copyist could have assumed this incomplete representation to be interpretable as a lacuna, in a piece self-evidently lacking ensemble parts. Nothing here, then, is in a category of notational oversight.

<sup>48</sup> A form of one can be supplied from extant organ parts, as for the incipit. It thus becomes likely that other ensemble lines are lacking in this verse, which has frequent interstices between short solo phrases.

<sup>49</sup> The alternative is incredible: that a composer began devising an accompaniment only after completing full vocal parts, and in mid-stream at that.

dissemination at an epoch of major cultivation and innovation. We can say nothing authoritative about first copying or performance.<sup>50</sup> One could begin to suspect on this basis that dual parts were roundly suppressed in some way; but what?

Consort anthems can be de-aggregated. Some may well have begun in combined parts for home music-making, especially if an already published evolved ‘form’ was a model. John Ward is the chief example. His single known musical employment was domestic. Only one of his anthems had currency in cathedral sources; the rest favour unliturgical scoring for two equal top lines.<sup>51</sup> Then, what of households? Could many summon the daunting double forces needed to render consort anthem in 5-6 parts? Did London citizen prosperity make it a regular event? Dual part-sets would have been a menace to store. Amalgamated sets will have been inviting on two other counts: they avoided paying for extra (or double) copying, and did not even need a full dual complement of users. By 1600 title-pages of madrigalian issues were coming to include a common subtitle for dual use: Byrd followed it in 1611 with *Psalmes . . . Fit for Voyces or Viols*. Its purpose may have been less to *recommend* doubling than guarantee all-round utility for prospective purchasers. A singer falls out? A player steps in; or *vice versa*.<sup>52</sup> Merged parts for anthems similarly enable one to ‘get by’. That is not to disallow possibilities that separate households joined forces with two sets of books.

Domestic sources leave unquantifiable the proportion of consort repertoire begun in dual part-sets. Retention after use would have been mainly as adjuncts in the context of anthem where full was anyway separately categorised from verse. Even if choral establishments made unsystematic provision, one would expect traces in this area; yet no contemporary seems to comment on it, and a hint of instrumental part-sets comes from only one cathedral. Loss of musical sources is apparently total in this area and, on any current index, unfactorable. This puts major constraint on any pronouncement about consort anthem’s normative usage. Simply, no-one can be sure that it was *not* performed in church. The repertoire itself does not divide neatly by function, to go by evidence of texts. ‘Hearken yee nations’ by Edmund Hooper, found in cathedral sources with organ alone, follows the foiling of the Gunpowder Plot. Since in full six-part counterpoint, surely it was devised and *performed* so, for full

---

<sup>50</sup> Pieces may have been circulated onwards chiefly in score; even so, the thesis about primary playing condition stands.

<sup>51</sup> ‘Let God arise’ à5, scored for two basses with a single high voice; significantly found at two pitches. Ward published no domestic verse anthem in his only madrigalian book à5-6 (1613): maybe on grounds of decorum and style. Richard Alison’s *Howres Recreation* is subtitled ‘. . . apt for Instru- | *mentes and Voyces*. | Framed for the delight of Gentlemen | and others which are wel affected to that qualitie, | *All for the most part with two trebles, necessarie for* | such as teach in priuate families’. None of Michael East’s consort anthems, published 1610, 1618, 1624 for a domestic market, occurs only in MS.

<sup>52</sup> This contrasts with Byrd’s practice in 1588-9 of giving consort songs underlay in all parts; but perhaps both practices are two sides of the same coin, in enabling mixed ensembles. Byrd did after all label ‘the first singing part’ in 1588, as if to make returns to origins easier.



effect? It is designed to impress, and on a scale to suggest public (not domestic) celebration. Why not make it a default assumption that this was in the Chapel Royal or Westminster Abbey, Hooper's work-places?<sup>53</sup> There is a remaining oddity: prolific anthem-composers at the centre of musical life in major institutions from whom one would expect the odd anthem in consort scoring, such as Nathaniel Giles and Adrian Batten, are totally unrepresented.

Or maybe this is all a blind alley. Whatever the problems, why snipe at church practice? Surely knowledge for its sources is secure? There, organ still rules. That makes missing parts or large source-loss for consort forms irrelevant; in the context of ritual nothing ruffles a stern divide of cathedral from home. But once evidence is scrutinised, this line is far less sturdy. Peter Le Huray's unchallenged, standard discussion of Anglican repertoire up to civil war frankly admitted a dearth of church sources for the whole foundation period until well beyond 1603: 'between 1565 and 1617 there is almost nothing, apart from the Ludlow fragments. The gap could not have been more awkwardly placed, for it completely spans the most fruitful period in the entire history of pre-Restoration English church music'.<sup>54</sup> That, unvarnished, is a musical void until 14 years after the death of Elizabeth I: the very time that consort anthem burgeoned. One cannot be sanguine to much greater degree over Jacobean sources: extant choirbook sets become ample only in the 1630s. Post-Restoration sources are pressed into service to fill the gaps, even for Gibbons; his 'O clap your hands together' à8 relies on the post-1670 Bing-Gostling Partbooks at York. Awkwardness is usually negotiated in respectful silence; but the skew of sources blights knowledge of church practice in the very period for which it has been allowed by default to dictate the terms of debate. Now even the most rabid positivist might hesitate to claim that the spread of available sources invalidates *all* assumed practice before 1630, in verse or full anthem; even so, a long-standing self-validating traditional consensus is too little questioned. Ironically, consort sources turn out to be closest in time to verse anthem's Jacobean Spring, and the best testimony, if in the 'wrong' arena.<sup>55</sup>

A dissentient glance at the period must then examine claims that cathedral ensemble parts did not and cannot have existed. Dr Le Huray noted instances in two verse anthems by Gibbons, found in choirbooks from a college and a private chapel c.1630-5: one bass and one fragmentary treble part, untexted. 'No other curious slips of this kind have yet been discovered in other music of the period', his remark, branded them isolates peculiar to one composer.<sup>56</sup> A preconception that inclusion of ensemble parts must have been error leads one

---

<sup>53</sup> His consort anthems lack bass parts in consort sources, but can be completed through organ parts.

<sup>54</sup> Le Huray (1967) Chapter 4 *passim*; quoted comment at p. 93, and sources listed in Table 19 (pp. 91-2).

<sup>55</sup> Introduction to Monson (1982), p. 2, made this exact point, with a somewhat different focus.

<sup>56</sup> GB-Cpc MSS Mus.6.1-6, 'Behold, I bring you glad tidings'; GB-Llp MS 764, 'Almighty God, who by thy son' (Cambridge, Peterhouse, and London, Lambeth Palace). Le Huray (1967) Chapter 9, 318.

to wonder of what extreme sort that oversight was; then to ask, instead, if instruments were *becoming* unwelcome in the 1630s at Lambeth or anywhere. Experts in church sources may be best placed to say if any further fragments have been dismissed for being similarly atypical or aberrant.<sup>57</sup> Still, another misinterpreted isolate in a valid source does occur: the posthumous collection by Thomas Tomkins, *Musica Deo Sacra* (1668). ‘O Lord, let me know mine end’ à5 here is a normal verse anthem but for one thing. Choirbook parts are given with full rests, except in the Bassus: that prints a consort part intact, untexted in verse sections.<sup>58</sup> Those verses, instrumental, are congruent with the *basso seguente* of the organ; though, quite legitimately, that breaks into a few decorations. Otherwise only a few minor dotted rhythms differ. Nothing here is variant enough to rule out performance jointly with ensemble: any contrary claim to suggest incompatibility lacks substantiation, or is just misguided.<sup>59</sup> The part, furthermore, must be a chance remnant of a whole set, passed to the printer in error for a ‘normal’ part and set up in good faith. (It is unlikelier that all other parts were doctored into conformity, segments excised by some scissors-and-paste method.) This instance of joint provision with an organ part is a middle case, since not an example of dual sets: if not full proof that either sort of part had cathedral use, it is strongly suggestive. It does prove that amalgamated parts were kept by, for some such use during the composer’s working life to 1642, but weeded on publication. There is another twist, though: this same piece is found in partbook sets for consort anthem, c.1610-1620, but textually at odds.<sup>60</sup> Tomkins must have worked up consort versions twice over; paralleling the incompatible doublets in Gibbons.<sup>61</sup> It suggests a period of demand in which he needed a ‘spare’. Different locales can explain that, since like other cathedral organists he was a pluralist. The title underlaid to the printed part’s first stave, ‘*The Symphony*’, may bear on terminology for

---

<sup>57</sup> A single part for ‘Know you not’ à5-7 by Tomkins (entitled a ‘Funerall Anthem’) is in the set GB-Och Mus 61-66. It is in amalgamated form, seemingly modified to adapt (combine) *divisi* lines in the now-missing parts for domestic use.

<sup>58</sup> *Musica Deo Sacra & Ecclesiae Anglicanae* (1668), 65-6. The publication’s history of preparation, by the composer’s son, vouches for integrity of copy.

<sup>59</sup> *Thomas Tomkins: Musica Deo Sacra: II* ed. Bernard Rose (Stainer & Bell for the British Academy; London, 1968) *EECM* 9 no. 16, in the 1668 form. To call the Bassus (p. 165) ‘not identical with the organ bass in *Pars Organica* and . . . probably a copy of the string part which was a companion to *M*’ (GB-Lbl Additional MSS 29366-8) is doubly inaccurate and inept.

<sup>60</sup> The solo voice-line is unaltered; the largest variants are for ensemble parts in a tripla verse-section. *Tomkins Consort Anthems* (1994) gives this form, completeable from the three partial sources GB-Lbl Additional MSS 29366-8, 29427; US-CLwr, Blossom Partbooks. All seem London-centred. Myriell copied 29427 before 29372-7, but did not recopy this piece. *EECM* 9 (1968) no. 16 prints the 1668 form, and lists 29366-8 and 29427.

<sup>61</sup> The example of Tomkins shows that Gibbons could have added new organ parts to revised consort forms. ‘Whenas we sat in Babylon’ à4 by Richard Farrant (d. 1580), verse anthem at its early stage (though copies are far later), survives with two incompatible organ parts; one factor that hinders definitive reconstruction and comment.

such parts on their first circulation.<sup>62</sup> (Compare the heading to the *ritornelli* of ‘Doe not repine’, to which partbooks give the title ‘*Preludium*’.) A now forgotten unrecorded part for ensemble in cathedrals is the harder to deny.

A parallel process is seen in consort song at times, when ensemble parts conclude with a chorus or refrain, demanding verbal underlay in all five lines. Did voice-integration into instrumental parts in this way precede amalgamated part-types for domestic verse-forms? Almost all examples postdate the type’s evolution and so give no evidence for priority. Choruses in Byrd’s sacred consort songs are all reconstructions by modern editors, but for just one line in a single partbook c.1580: slender basis for a case, however likely, that underlay was customarily inserted into instrumental parts.<sup>63</sup> If combined parts for consort song had ousted dual sets of books, they would be undetectable, as usual. Except that one partbook set along such lines *does* survive. Copied from c.1605 onward, it preserves the domestic output of William Wigthorp, sometime organist at New College, Oxford: it has solos and duets, secular or devotional, some with underlaid choruses.<sup>64</sup> It amounts to six books, so as to include doubling vocal parts. (A seventh book or fascicle, needed for

---

<sup>62</sup> Forms of ‘symphony’ emerge by 1630: (a) titling of two *ritornello*-type ‘Symphonia’ by Nicholas Lanier, GB-Och Mus 379-381 (c.1630); (b) Walter Porter *Madrigals and Ayres* (1632), a titlepage broadly specifying ‘toccatos, Sinfonias and Ritornellos’; (c) similar *ritornelli* (in all but name) à3 under the name of Henry Lawes. The first two are headed ‘Simphonie in St Johns play. before the song’, ‘2<sup>d</sup> Simphonie before the 2<sup>d</sup> Songe’; seemingly for enactments at the Oxford college of the name during the royal progress of 1636: GB-Ob MSS Mus. Sch. D.233-6: 233 f. 32, 234 ff. 43-4, 236 f.27, also with 2 further simphonies à2 (Tr-B only); (d) George Jeffries autograph score, Add. MS 10338. Peter Holman ‘George Jeffries and the “great dooble base”’, *Cheyls* 5 (1973-4) Correspondence, 79-81; Peter Holman ‘The “Symphony”’, *Cheyls* 6 (1975-6), 10-24, including other sources, later 1630s, on not included above. In Christmastide verse, some set by Henry Lawes and performed for Charles I at Whitehall probably 1640-1, Robert Herrick used ‘flourish’ to describe instrumental interludes: *Hesperides* (1647-8). David Pinto ‘The True Christmas: Carols at the Court of Charles I’ *William Lawes (1602-1645) Essays on His Life, Times and Work* ed. Andrew Ashbee (Ashgate; Aldershot, 1998), 97-120.

<sup>63</sup> *William Byrd Consort Songs for Voice and Viols* ed. Philip Brett (Stainer & Bell; London, 1970) *Byrd Edition* 15. Chorus is added editorially to nos. 1-2, 4, 20. For no. 5, only, a waif Contratenor book, GB-Ob MS Mus. Sch. E.423, has a rubric and underlay: David Mateer ‘William Byrd, John Petre and Oxford, Bodleian MS Mus. Sch. E. 423’, *Royal Musical Association Research Chronicle* 29 (1996), 21-46. Byrd entitled two pieces à5-6 published in 1589 as ‘Carowle’. Here untexted lines do not merge into texted ‘full’ choruses, which are printed apart, differentiated by scoring à4, *tessitura* and clefs. ‘Christ rising / Christ is risen again’ in 1589 is the first dated instance of amalgamated parts with instrumental lines leading into texted chorus underlay; well-circulated in church sources with reductions for organ but seemingly primarily for six-part consort. ‘O God that guides the cheerful’ of 1611 is also worth noting: close to the border between carol-form consort song, with chorus, and verse anthem.

<sup>64</sup> GB-Lbl Additional MSS 17786-17791: Monson (1982) Chapter 5, 159-180. The set’s repertoire is entirely secular in five parts; six-part a mix of texted Latin, Latin-English, and English, also fantasia and almaine; the two seven-part are English anthems. ‘Phantasia Richard Deringe’ at f. 35v is Hieronymus Praetorius ‘Gaudete omnes’ à6, untexted. The correct attribution survives in a fantasia source: David Pinto ‘Marsh, Mico and Attributions’, *Cheyls* 27 (1999), 40-58.

completing anthems 27 by Weelkes and Tomkins, is lost: they, and six further items, have full vocal underlay.)

In these books, all lines are intact for all instrumental contents. Voice parts are present for only about half the solo songs (and for duets, never both); the rest were in the missing book. Craig Monson's survey of the set made a point that others have tended to neglect: singers are doubled in *all* songs.<sup>65</sup> Instrumental books prove this function; they are, after all, the ones that survive whole. The aberrance is *not* to double the voices, for the repertoire of this set if no other. It is wholly futile to argue that its wordless doubling part was copied *so as not to be played*, even in embellished vocal lines like 'This merry pleasant springe'.<sup>66</sup> The constraint placed on the concept of solo voice is a point not so well received as it should be.<sup>67</sup> 'Borne is the babe' is one devotional song ending in a chorus for which all instrumental lines add verbal underlay; even to the previously untexted line that doubles voice: which makes a chorus of five in addition to the soloist.<sup>68</sup> How both voices were doubled in duets can be seen in a dialogue among contents hitherto unpublished in full: see the Appendix. This set falls into the period for amalgamated part-sets, printed or manuscript, and cannot vouch for early practice; only suggest it. Incomplete as it stands, though, it does confirm doubling practice in a domestic arena. Its copyists and users were seemingly amongst musical members of Oxford colleges participating in choral services: for them to have erected a tacit barrier between leisure practices and official duties seems an artificial distinction for us to presume.

Into this context fit disclosures by Roger Bowers: contemporary testimony of instrumental parts in use. Sackbut players at Canterbury Cathedral had a music book specifically for playing with the choir.<sup>69</sup> Records of 1625 refer to a

---

<sup>65</sup> See also Craig Monson 'Consort Song and Verse anthem: a few performance problems', *JVDGSA* 8 (1976), 4-11.

<sup>66</sup> *MB* 22 no. 62; giving further ornaments printed small, unique to a source for voice with lute, GB-Lbl Egerton MS 2971. Listing in the Viola da Gamba Society *Thematic Index* of this edition's anonymous contents, for voice and four instruments (A-CS-1/3), could be stretched to admit to five-part instrumentation with voice, for items from this source if no other.

<sup>67</sup> *Thematic Index* also misrepresented source practice for all songs listed for Wigthorp. 'Come hither', discussed below, is credited to 'voice + 5 viols' instead of 2 voices, 5 viols (5-part); as applies also to 'Smiths are good fellows' and 'I am not I'. 'Were I made juror' should be 1 voice, 5 viols (5-part). 'To plead my faith', arranging Daniel Bachelier's setting of famous verse by his master the Earl of Essex, has no voice-part credited. Text does though survive in 17790 for the top line; it is scored, then, as for 'Were I made juror'. The point about scoring, amplified below, stands even though—precisely because, in fact—this source habitually labelled consort songs and duets '5 voc.'

<sup>68</sup> Chorus text sits uneasily in the Tenor voice, which cannot accommodate the refrain's first four words. Maybe doubts are valid here, not simply over chorus insertions. Archaic style could make the piece a pre-Byrdian survival, unless poor part-writing and underlay makes it likelier to be a more recent elaboration from a simpler, maybe lute-accompanied, form. As presented in score, *MB* 22 no. 46, the singer is not doubled. Obscuring the practice in the part-set is implicitly to discourage it; though doubling parts are mentioned in the introduction, and textless parts listed in the commentary.

<sup>69</sup> There is nothing for cornettists, whether a failure of record or categorisation.

payment for repairs to the ‘Sackbut book’, and another of 1634-5 for ‘prickinge one service in both Sackbut bookes’.<sup>70</sup> One may take that to be in anthems as well as services. Viol players of the cathedral also had manuscripts of sacred music for their use: in 1626-7, the chapter spent about 40 shillings to have *cantiones* (usually designating choral polyphony, Dr Bowers interprets) copied ‘for the viols’. Peter Webster has summarised evidence assembled by Ian Payne for the use of wind and viols; little of this though is repertoire-specific or relates to extant sources, and cannot show how or where instruments were used in services (or indeed whether the viols commonly maintained by choral establishments had any function at all for such uses).<sup>71</sup> Do then surviving choirbooks represent practice manicured somewhat as the 1630s progressed? In 1633 came the start of Laud’s rule as Archbishop of Canterbury, and the inception of his visitations. Laud is known to been suspicious of the private chapel movement, where the consort anthem repertoire may have been most in use. If one adds, as put forward convincingly by Dr Webster, that there is no real evidence to associate Laudians with musical ceremony in cathedral practice apart from the one large exception of John Cosin at Durham, it is even possible to wonder if Laud’s much-quoted ‘beauty of holiness’ in ceremony expressed his desire to impose conformity, and stamp his authority, more than see music as inevitable part of that beauty. Laud’s writ as Dean in the Chapel Royal ran 1626-43, and could have induced a new sobriety there too. The exiguous trace of ensemble parts in surviving chapel and cathedral sources may then be signs of just how the pruning process first began (and has been taken as a norm). Absence of contemporary testimony or sources cuts two ways here, and depends on validity of other evidence for bolstering either argument. The output of Gibbons is another part of the rejoinder: in itself, and as part of a body of general work with polyphonic, even highly contrapuntal accompanying material. It is significant and large enough to show that organ accompaniment was not always a sole or even primary form.

Remapping ‘consort’ against ‘verse’ should lead, from a textual point of view, to a view of the form of music *on the original page*. For some part of the repertoire (how large cannot be told), original performance of a piece will have needed copies in distinct sets for voices, ensemble, and (or) keyboard.<sup>72</sup> Most likely this evolving repertoire would in the first instance have been loose: not added to pre-existing bound volumes, nor possibly copied for use beyond the immediate, and so for easy transportation (as in saddle-packs) on oblong quarto paper, not best-quality but still practical. A fairly basic keyboard form may have been outlined, to go by many organ sources concentrated on vocal texture with independent matter left sketchy. Signs are of some sorts of organ

---

<sup>70</sup> Roger Bowers ‘The liturgy of the cathedral and its music, c. 1070-1642’, *A History of Canterbury Cathedral* ed. Patrick Collinson, Nigel Ramsay, Margaret Sparks (Oxford, 1995), 408-50; at pp. 445, 450.

<sup>71</sup> *Id.*, 445; cited by Webster (2001) Part II chapter 9; especially 156-61.

<sup>72</sup> One cannot presume a score as such if a composer assembled parts piecemeal from sections drafted in provisional or temporary form; maybe on card, leather or slate, and not necessarily in semi-permanent paper form.

part available for combining with extant ensemble sets, but so few that for now queries have to remain. Dual part-sets may have been combined fairly quickly as a matter of course, carrying through sheaves of parts to a next stage, through the medium of score as well. Economising copying-time was surely paramount. A chain of recopying from an amalgamated stock set of parts, for a consideration, had its clientèle in private chapels; but even the gentry may not have had the manpower to use complementary part-sets for anthems. Thus the mould will have been set early on. How cathedral establishments may have reacted to new material is another matter. They may have bought in consort material on occasion, especially if it reflected central practice. How often they will have used it is less clear. What is clear by contraries is that cathedrals are a place to expect traces of dual part-sets, but also where they are lacking, except for the scantiest of traces as mentioned. Evidence for private chapels barely exists, or is to be assessed. If this is all accepted, the situation is bleaker than realised, and leaves little sage counsel in trying to shape a coherent programme against defects. One recourse is a pro-active shift in focus, maybe to build on (rather than dismiss) meagre evidence to suggest patterns in activity; as for example in considering stray remarks by casual visitors to cathedrals mentioning ensemble accompaniment other than by organ. Common hearty dismissal of such evidence relies on a positivism that, as shown above, is not itself robustly founded.<sup>73</sup> A further step is to burrow afresh for evidence, of any stripe; in private chapels, as much as the Chapels Royal, since the enigma of doublet versions in Gibbons is not yet solved.

---

<sup>73</sup> Lieutenant Hammond at Exeter, on 'their viols and other sweet instruments and tunable voices': one of only two citations found by Le Huray, (1967) 128; from Hammond's journals 1634-5. It is, of course, a moot point whether this was in the cathedral itself. *A Relation of a Short Survey of 26 Counties, Observed in a Seven Weeks Journey begun on August 11, 1634, by a Captain, a Lieutenant, and an Ancient, all three of the Military Company in Norwich* ed. and intr. with notes L[eonold]. G[eorge]. Wickham Legg (F. E. Robinson & Co.; London, 1904). See GB-Lbl Additional MS 34754 (19th-century copy?). L. G. Wickham Legg 'A Relation of a Short Survey of the Western Counties Made by a Lieutenant of the Military Company in Norwich in 1635' Camden Society Third Series Volume 52 (July 1936), 1-128; *Camden Miscellany* XVI (Royal Historical Society 1936).

## Appendix

### Doubling partbooks: an underappreciated setting of verse by the Earl of Oxford

The British Library's 'Wigthorp' partbooks first came to notice for five-part dance.<sup>74</sup> (Some of that may have been texted in a now-missing vocal partbook.<sup>75</sup>) Total instrumental-vocal content à5-7 includes no consort anthem, but instead consort song, much of it archaic by 1605.<sup>76</sup> There are also more recent, locally-composed duets, by Richard Nicholson (at Magdalen College) and William Wigthorp, some with vocal chorus.<sup>77</sup> All lack a voice, but texts have been salvaged for five.<sup>78</sup> Among so far underexamined incomplete pieces is a sixth titled 'Come hither &c' in ensemble books, and 'a dialogue' in the extant vocal partbook (Additional MS 17790). That alone writes out a musical repeat for a third stanza, to introduce a third set of words in the last two verses, interchanging phrases of underlay. The lost part will have followed that pattern in its now-lost wording. To it, the extant voice responds *alternatim* in rhyme; single lines, until a shift to distichs in the last (third) stanza.

The snatches of text provide a trail leading to a short dialogue in the canon for Edward de Vere, 12th Earl of Oxford; first printed in *Brittons Bowre of Delights* (1591). Identification from partial wording is news only in a musical context.<sup>79</sup>

---

<sup>74</sup> *Eight Short Elizabethan Dance Tunes for Small String Orchestra or Quintet* ed. Edmund H. Fellowes (Stainer & Bell; London, 1924) edn no. 2948: MS nos. 4-6, 11, 31-4. *Six English Tunes from the XVI and early XVII Centuries for String Quintet (from a MS. in the British Museum circa 1625)* ed. Peter Warlock (Oxford University Press; London, 1926) Oxford Orchestral Series 28: MS nos. 4, 6, 11, 18, 32-3.

<sup>75</sup> For example '[When] Daphne', retexted in MB 22; maybe 'My Robbin is to the [greenwood gone]', tantalisingly short of a text, and 'Mr Dowlands Lacrimæ', adapted in Wigthorp style but a fourth higher; though these could all be instrumental.

<sup>76</sup> The only two fully-texted à5 are secular and have no wordless parts: a macaronic anti-monkish travesty 'Resurrexit a mortuis', and Thomas Weelkes, 'Grace my louely one faire bewties'. It is often assumed that the books may be Wigthorp's own copying since his name lacks honorifics. This is not quite uniform: he appears as 'mr Wigthorp' at Add. MS 17791 f. 11.

<sup>77</sup> Monson (1982) gives source-lists and a thorough discussion: Chapter 5 'The Oxford Sources', principally pp. 159-180. One partbook includes two duets 'For two Basse Violls and the Organ' by 'Jo: Coperario': Add. MS 17790 ff. 12v-14, VdGS nos. 7-8. Even if these were completed in the missing book, how an organ part was attached, if casually, is yet again unexplained.

<sup>78</sup> 'Joane quoth John/John quoth Joane', 'Smithes are good fellowes', 'What meate eates the spaniard', 'I am not I of such belief', 'Of all iolly pastimes': MB 22 nos. 51, 55, 57-9.

<sup>79</sup> *Brittons Bowre of Delights 1591* ed. Hyder Edward Rollins (Harvard University Press; Cambridge, Mass, 1933) facsimile reprint. Steven W. May "The poems of Edward De Vere, Seventeenth Earl of Oxford and of Robert Devereux, Second Earl of Essex", *Studies in Philology* 77 (Winter 1980), Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1-132, listed the set Add. MSS 17786-17791 for the first time for this piece (no. 11), but as 17790-6, without direct reference to the later publication, first noticed in Thomas Percy's *Reliques* (1765). His text did not follow or take notice of the 1591 version.

It takes a form well-known for centuries, though in disguise; extra first and last verses modify appearance and focus. For this adapted form, the only complete source was late printed; a rehashed, garbled text by then, but at least of use in completing this setting.<sup>80</sup> ‘Come hither Shepherd swain’ begins the verse devised to preface de Vere’s opening (‘When wert thou borne Desire?’). The music, even if seventy years earlier, has a text of no better standing, of the same compromised stock. For these purposes though verse has to yield and serve the setting, not least because musical structure embeds the adaptations. The verse original is not hard to find, moreover; and is included below for good measure.

That original dialogue is interrogative: each line a complete question and reply, called ‘*Antipophora*, or Figure of responce’ in a grammarian’s quoted excerpt.<sup>81</sup> As first printed it was continuously set in unspaced pairs of alexandrines and fourteeners (poulter’s measure). The later version teased it out into quatrains giving visible stichomythia: trimeters varied by a tetrameter in third place (short metre, 6.6.8.6; favoured by Emily Dickinson for terseness). Curiously, the first and final inserted verses, as later printed, both have shortened third lines (printed as four trimeters 6.6.6.6, equal to two alexandrines) but in all medial verses keep the original *second* lines (fourteeners) unaltered. The shorter lines accord with the music’s opening phrase-lengths; but those are unvariable, and so cannot handle exactly the original tetrameter phrases (all in bar 5, of the score given here). The missing voice, unavailable for interrogation, would have had to accommodate an extra syllable of underlay in stanzas 2-3 at that point: unpolished, but possible and necessary.

The surviving voice-part sings half-phrases of a tune. The first halves, in the missing dialogue voice, are musically covered (and more) by the extant doubling instrumental partbook. Joined, they make the ballad tune ‘Rowland’. This may have had its origin as an item in Will Kemp’s acclaimed jigs, and is thought to have accompanied him on tours of the Low Countries and Denmark 1585-6, to become familiar over northern Europe. Its second title ‘Lord Willobies Welcome Home’ is from alternative ballad use, after the return to England in 1589 of Peregrine Bertie, 13th Baron Willoughby de Eresby (1555-1601), from command over expeditionary forces in the Netherlands.<sup>82</sup>

---

<sup>80</sup> [Thomas Deloney] *The Garland of Good=Will* (London, 1678) sig. G3r-v: Second Part, numbered 6, titled ‘A Communication between Fancy and desire’. Its placement is hard to fathom; the table of contents does not list it, ending at no. 5 in this part; similarly unlisted in reprints 1685, 1688: *STC* (Wing) 946, 947, 947A. It has solecisms: e.g., line 1 ‘Shepherds’, in which Deloney’s hand seems most unlikely. Percy seems to have assumed it the completest form and not a rehandled adaptation.

<sup>81</sup> George Puttenham *The Arte of English Poesie* (London, 1589) Part III Chapter IX, labels the piece ‘an emblem of desire otherwise called *Cupide*’. Its model is no emblem, though, but an Italian sonnet by Panfilo Sassi: Rollins (1933).

<sup>82</sup> Charles Read Baskervill *The Elizabethan Jig and Related Song Drama* (University Chicago Press; Chicago, 1931) Chapter VII ‘Jests and Novella plots in the Ballad Jig’, especially 217-234.



For the two top lines, three parts survive in clef G2; those for the second line are complementary vocal-instrumental.<sup>83</sup> They double at the unison, but the instrumental line continues when the voice has fully-notated rests. The lost book would likewise have sung its own half-phrases and then rested as mandated. The procedure shifts in the third musical stanza: to conclude, each voice sings two consecutive lines. Lengthened verse-phrases result in musical interchange, as seen here in the score. That musical change is made to suit the final original verse (here, the penultimate). Since it did not concern the added final verse, the result was a small new vocal melisma in it, not transmitted to the accompaniment. These details in a minor item merit attention, especially for the slight deviations, as in the varied melisma (bar 22), since they validate exactly the practice of doubling parts suggested for a lost form of partbook set. Last notes of vocal phrases also can differ in length (every four bars, 8-20). This set is an extant missing link, not so remote as it turns out, between consort song and discarded original sets of parts for consort anthem.

The music's half-lines and its late printed form also concur in rearranging the form first printed: it interchanges lines 21-24 with 25-28 (taking the added verses as lines 1-4, 33-36).<sup>84</sup> Pile on that the metrical departure in the two added verses, and little shred of possibility is left that anything in this composite can be attached to de Vere. There is no sign that the ballad tune predated composition of the verse (in circulation by late 1582).<sup>85</sup> The words are then most unlikely to have been written to this music. Rather the exact contrary; it was for the sake of the music that embracing stanzas were added, in order to match the whole better (in length and phrase) against a recent popular tune. What is gained is a better appreciation of performance practice. A piece in Wigthorp's usual firmly rhythmic style, with limited contrapuntal enterprise, is crafted around an 'orchestration' nominally in five parts, labelled as such, and one that never rises above five-part writing (apart from the voice-doubling) but is pieced out over seven. Here, it requires vocal and instrumental pairs to regroup in the final section. That level of abstraction is noteworthy when considering Wigthorp's work, which as found in this set has attracted unfavourable descriptions.<sup>86</sup> In this instance he took some pains to devise apt

---

<sup>83</sup> Add. 17786 first voice, untexted, 17790 responding voice with 17787. The piece has been as published as five-part dance: Warlock (1926), edn no. 5; *English Ballad Tunes in ensemble settings (c. 1600)* ed. Bernard Thomas (London Pro Musica; London, 1985), LPM TM 51, edn no. 6.

<sup>84</sup> The music's verbal fragments are as unsatisfactory as the later form: the text arrangement below mixes both freely.

<sup>85</sup> The date comes from a part-quotation in *Philotimus. The Warre Betwixt Nature and Fortune*. This was seemingly set up by December 1582: Ralph Maud 'The Date of Brian Melbancke's *Philotimus*', *The Library Vth Series* xi/2 (June 1956), 118-120; also May (1980), commentary to the verse (no. 11).

<sup>86</sup> Artisan practice is visible in head-on parallel motion, bar 8, and in the penultimate bar of the first strain the same only just avoided by inserting a rest. In scoring terms it is noteworthy that in the third stanza the voices migrate between different doubling instruments; a parallel with practice in Myriell's copies of consort anthems by Tomkins, where bass soloists at times are doubled by a tenor-range instrument.

scoring. That intent and commitment, in turn, show instrumental doubling as routine practice, for this Oxford circle—and maybe others.

Come hither &c A dialogue  
British Library Additional MSS 17786-17791  
f. 11 (7v, 17790)

(Edward de Vere, 12th Earl of Oxford, adapted by anon.)  
(‘Rowland’; arr.) William Wigthorp  
ed. and reconstr. David Pinto

5

1. Come hither Shepherd swain. Sir what do you require? I prithee shew thy Name, My name is Fond Desire. When
2. What had'st thou for to drink? Unfained lovers' tears. What cradle wast thou rocked in? In Love devoid of fears. What
3. Doth company displease? Yea sure, in many a one. Where doth Desire delight to live? He loves to live alone. Doth

Bass (line VII) bar 8 note 1: semibreve in MS. Note parallel octaves in lines II and VI

wast thou born, Desire? In pomp and pride of May. By whom (sweet Child) wast thou begot? Of fond Conceit, men say. Tell  
lull'd thee then asleep? Sweet speech, which lik'd me best. Tell me where is thy dwelling place? In gentle hearts I rest. What

20

me, who was thy Nurse? Sweet Youth, and sugred joys. What was thy meat and dainty food? Sad sighs and great annoys. thing doth please thee most? To gaze on beauty still. Whom dost thou think to be thy Foe? Disdain of my good-will.

me, who was thy Nurse? Sweet Youth, and sugred joys. What was thy meat and dainty food? Sad sighs and great annoys.  
 thing doth please thee most? To gaze on beauty still. Whom dost thou think to be thy Foe? Disdain of my good-will.

v. 3 only

10 15

either Time or Age bring you un- to de- cay? No, no, De-sire both lives and dies, ten thousand times a day. Then

either Time or Age bring you unto decay? No, no, Desire both lives and dies, ten thousand times a day. Then



Fond Desire, farewell; thou art no mate for me. I would be loth to dwell with such a one as thee.

The text originally published in 1591 is given here for comparison: roman and black letter font is changed to italic and roman respectively, and initial drop capitals for 'vv' suppressed.

*Of the birth and bringing vp of desire.*

VWhen wert thou borne Desire? in pompe and prime of May:  
By whō sweet boy wert thou begot? by good cōceit mē say  
Tell me who was thy nurse? fresh youth in sugred ioy:  
What was thy meat and dayly food? sore sighes with great annoy.  
What had you then to drinke? unfained louers teares:

[5]

What cradle were you rocked in? in Hope deuoid of feares.  
What brought you then a sleepe? sweet speach that liked men best:  
And where is now your dwelling place? in gentle hearts I rest.  
Doth companie displease? it doth in many one.  
Where would *Desire* then choose to be? he likes to muse alone.

[10]

What feedeth most your sight? to gaze on fauour still:  
Who find you most to be thy foe? Disdaine of my good will.  
Will ever age or death bring you unto decay?  
No, no, *Desire* both liues and dies ten thousand times a day.

*Finis. E. of Ox.*

## A list of manuscripts found in the *Thematic Index* containing music for viols

Andrew Ashbee

Discussions have taken place in recent months with *Répertoire International des Sources Musicales* (RISM) in the hope that closer links may be created between that enterprise and the Viola da Gamba Society. Where relevant, RISM files increasingly mention work by the VdGS, especially the *Thematic Index* and the *Index of Manuscripts Containing Consort Music*. We hope to develop this association further in the years ahead. Happily the code-system used for themes adopted for the new VdGS searchable index is almost identical to that found in RISM when typing/searching for incipits via notes on their keyboard.

One surprising omission from the Society's presentations is a list of manuscripts known to contain music for viols, so here is a first attempt to rectify the gap. At the moment pages 8-11 of the *Thematic Index* is a 'list of libraries containing all printed and manuscript sources known to the Society which include music written or transcribed for viols, including consort songs.' This was compiled early on by Gordon Dodd from the Society's card-index and has remained more-or-less unchanged since then. In this list I have retained those libraries listed by Gordon which, so far as I know, contain only printed rather than manuscript sources. In many places the card index is extremely rough, but I have used it as my starting point. At one end of the spectrum are manuscripts which might contain just one voice of a consort song and at the other comprehensive lists of music found in the major sets. Printed sources are listed within the main bibliography of the *Thematic Index*, so the present list confines itself to those libraries in which consort and lyra viol manuscripts are to be found and to those manuscripts currently known to be held there. With numerous examples of music arranged or copied for both violins and viols, the *Thematic Index* is now expanding coverage to include a substantial amount of 17<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> music for the violin family, such as sets of theatre pieces, and there are increasing numbers of later pieces from the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries to take account of. There have always been difficulties in establishing precise border-lines for the *Thematic Index* – a good case in point is Ward's *Cor Mio* which Gordon excluded entirely as a vocal piece, but which I have re-instated – and I guess Gordon would not be happy about my incorporating music in which, depending on circumstances, a bass viol may or may not have joined an instrumental group primarily made up from members of the violin family. My own view is that, say, late seventeenth-century theatre music, is closely related to consort airs of the time and needs indexing just as much as the viol consorts; the *Thematic Index* is a valid place to do this. In indexing the pieces in *Apollo's Banquet* too (for the 2016 update) I have also become very aware that Playford was keen to provide the latest tunes from the theatres and elsewhere in arrangements for all kinds of instruments and published them in versions for cittern, harpsichord, lyra viol, violin, and flageolet/flute/recorder.

Both the *Thematic Index* and RISM are works in progress, but I have tried to find current RISM links for the manuscripts of interest to us. These are to the whole manuscript rather than to an individual piece. There are still major gaps, of course, such as Christ Church, Oxford, which RISM has yet to work on, but John Milsom's splendid on-line catalogue will help researchers here. Another area which I have not pursued below is the Duben collection at Uppsala, but again most of the original manuscripts can be accessed directly at

[www.musik.uu.se/duben/Duben.php](http://www.musik.uu.se/duben/Duben.php) I have included a few references to digital copies of manuscripts freely available on-line.

Supplements will be needed from time to time, but this list will go into the 2016 *Thematic Index* up-date. I will be grateful for any corrections and additions.

## LIBRARIES AND MANUSCRIPTS

### A-AUSTRIA

ETGöess	Ebenthal, Privatsammlung Göess
MS A	
MS B	
MS C	
Gö	Gottweig, Benediktinerstifts Bibliothek, Musikarchiv.
KN	Klosterneuberg, Augustiner-Chorherrenstift
SPL	St Paul, Stift
Wgm	Wien, Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde.
	XI 36270
Wn	Wien, Österreichische National Bibliothek.
	MS 16786

### B-BELGIUM

Bc	Brussels, Conservatoire.
MS 5634	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/searchid?=703000125">https://opac.rism.info/searchid?=703000125</a>
MS 5635	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/searchid?=703000126">https://opac.rism.info/searchid?=703000126</a>
MS Litt XY 24910	
MS Fétis 7382C	
II 4103 (5) Mus. Fétis 3054	
Lvu	Louvain, Université Louvain
P206	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/searchid?=702000549">https://opac.rism.info/searchid?=702000549</a>
Br	Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale Albert 1er

### CH-SWITZERLAND

Besa	Bern, Staatsarchiv des Kantons.
------	---------------------------------

### CS-CZECHOSLOVAKIA

KRa	Kroměříž: Liechtenstein-Kastelkorn collection
4:52	
4:96a	
4:231(4)	
Pnm	Praha: Národní Muzeum.
XXII A 7	

## D-GERMANY

- B                      Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz.  
Mus. ms.autogr. Bach P357  
Mus. ms.autogr. Hove 1  
AMB 225  
AMB 235  
AMB 240  
AMB 479  
AMB 498  
AMB 499  
KHM 9  
KHM 20  
KHM 24  
KHM 25  
KHM 25a and b                      <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=463002599>  
M1905.247  
Mus. MS 252/10                      <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=452001950>  
Mus. MS 253/10                      <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=452001952>  
Mus. MS 254/15                      <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=452001954>  
Mus. MS 256                      <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=452007458>  
Mus. MS 257/1                      <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=452001960>  
Mus. MS 257/3                      <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=452001962>  
Mus. MS 263                      <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=452001967>  
Mus. MS13525                      <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=456014964>  
P 357  
SA 3627  
Sig. Klg. 6  
Sig. Klg. 63/1, 2
- Bds                      Berlin, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek  
Lynar A.2
- Dbrd-Kl  
MS Mus Anhang 28
- Dbrd-Urch  
MS 130a-b
- DI                      Dresden, Bibliothek und Museum Löbau  
Mus. 2160-Q-2                      <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=212001408>  
Mus. 2160-Q-3                      <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=212001409>  
Mus. 2160-Q-5                      <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=212001411>
- DS                      Darmstadt, Hessische Landes- und Hochschulbibliothek  
Mus. MS 327                      <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=450001964>  
Mus. MS 1042/85                      <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=450002876>  
Mus. MS 1042/86                      <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=450002877>  
Mus. MS 1042/87                      <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=450002878>  
Mus. MS 1042/89                      <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=450002880>  
Mus. MS 1042/90                      <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=450002881>  
Mus. MS 1042/92                      <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=450002883>  
Mus. MS 1045/6                      <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=450002886>



Hs Hamburg, Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek.  
 MA/1019  
 ND VI 3193 <https://opac.rism.info/searchid?=451513336>

F Frankfurt-am-Main, Universitätsbibliothek Johann Christian  
 Senckenberg  
 Mus Hs 337 <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=455000552>

Kl Kassel, Landesbibliothek.  
 2° MS Mus. 35  
 2° MS Mus. 60  
 2<sup>0</sup> MS Mus. 61.1(1)  
 2<sup>0</sup> MS Mus. 61.1(2)  
 4° MS Mus. 72  
 4° MS Mus. 108:2  
 4° MS Mus. 108:3  
 4<sup>0</sup> MS Mus. 108:4  
 4<sup>0</sup> MS Mus. 108:5  
 4<sup>0</sup> MS Mus. 108.6  
 4<sup>0</sup> MS Mus. 108.7  
 4° MS Mus. 125  
 Mus. Fol. 61

Lem Leipzig, Musikbibliothek der Stadt.

Mbs Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek  
 Mus. MS 1503h

Müs Münster, Santini-Bibliothek.

OB Otterbeuren, Benediktinerabtei, Musik archiv.

RH Rheda, Fürst zu Bentheim-Tecklenburgische Bibliothek

Rou Rostock, Universitätsbibliothek

SÜN Sünching, Schloss  
 MS 12

Swl Landesbibliothek Mecklenburg-Vorpommern, Schwerin

Tu Tübingen, Universitätsbibliothek.

Ush Ulm, van Schermer'sche Familienstiftung.

W Wolfenbüttel, Herzog-August Bibliothek.  
 Cod. Guelf 34.7.aug.2<sup>o</sup> <http://diglib.hab.de/wdb.php?dir=mss/34-7-aug-2f>

WRtl Weimar, Thüringische Landesbibliothek, Musiksammlung

## **DK-DENMARK**

Kk København, Det Kongelige bibliothek.  
 CI 10; mu 6403 2402 <http://img.kb.dk/ma/div/rochette-m.pdf>

## **E-SPAIN**

SE Segovia, Catedral

## **F-FRANCE**

B Besançon, Bibliothèque Municipale.  
 Lym Lyons, Bibliothèque Municipale

129.949

Nm Nantes, Bibliothèque Municipale.

Pc Paris, Conservatoire (MSS at Pn)

Pcnrs Paris, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.

Unnumbered, lute MS

Pn Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale.

Ms Rés 492

MS Rés 1111

MS Rés 1122

Ms Rés 1185

MS Rés F. 494

MS Rés F. 770

Vm<sup>7</sup> 673

Vm<sup>7</sup> 674-5

Vm<sup>7</sup> 2513

Vm<sup>7</sup> 6298

Vm<sup>7</sup> 6300

Vm<sup>7</sup> 6301

Vm<sup>7</sup> 6308

Psg Paris, Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève.

TNm Tournus, Bibliothèque Municipale

## GB-GREAT BRITAIN

AB Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales.

Brogyntyn 27

BEV Beverley, East Riding of Yorkshire CRO.

DDHO/20/1-3

CAR Carlisle Cathedral Chapter Library.

Cfm Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum.

24.E.13-17

Mu. MS 46

Mu. MS 117

Mu. MS 168

Mu. MS 261

Mu. MS 634

Mu. MS 640

Mu. MS 641

Mu. MS 642

Mu. MS 645

Mu. MS 646

Mu. MS 647

Mu. MS 689

Mu. MS 734

Mu. MS 1002-3

Cjc Cambridge, St. John's College Library.

Ckc Cambridge, King's College, Rowe Music Library.

MSS 112-13

MS 113A  
 MSS 114-17  
 MS 316  
 MS 321  
 Cp Cambridge, Peterhouse College Library.  
 Cpc Cambridge, Pembroke College Library.  
 Cpl Cambridge, Pendlebury Music Library.  
 Ctc Cambridge, Trinity College Library.  
 Cu Cambridge, University College Library.  
 Add. 8894  
 MS Dd. 3,18  
 MS Dd. 5.20 <http://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/collections/music>  
 MS Dd. 5.21  
 MS Dd. 5.78 <http://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/collections/music>  
 MS Dd. 6.48  
 MS Dd. 9.33 <http://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/collections/music>  
 MS Dd. 14.24  
 MS Nn. 6.36 <http://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/collections/music>  
 MS Hen. Dep. 77(1)  
 MS Hen. Dep. 77(2)  
 CF Chelmsford, Essex CRO.  
 D/DP 26/1  
 D/DP 26/2  
 CHER Chester, Cheshire CRO, Leicester of Tabley Archives.  
 DLT/B 31  
 DRc Durham Cathedral Library.  
 MS A27 <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806931276>  
 MS D2 <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806929467>  
 MS D4 <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806934066>  
 MS D5 <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806934065>  
 MS D10 <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806934453>  
 MSS M.179-180 <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806934444>  
 MS M193/1 <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806934756>  
 MS M195  
 MS M196 <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806908905>  
 DU Dundee, Public Library.  
 Blackie MS  
 EL Ely Cathedral Library (MSS deposited at Cu).  
 En Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland.  
 Adv.5.2.19  
 Dep. 314/24  
 MS 2833  
 MS 3296  
 MS 3346  
 MS 5777  
 MSS 9445-7  
 MS 9450  
 MS 9452

MS 9453  
 MSS 9465-7  
 MS 9468  
 MS 9469  
 MS P637 R787.1  
 Sutherland MS  
 Eu                      Edinburgh, University Library.  
 La III 483  
 Reid Library, Mus.m.1  
 Ge                      Glasgow, University Library, Euing Collection.  
 GUm                    Guildford, Museum & Muniments.  
                          MS Lm1083/91/35  
 HAdolmetsch        Haslemere, Dolmetsch Library.  
                          MS II.B.3  
                          MS II.C.24  
                          MS II.C.25  
 Lam                    London, Royal Academy of Music  
                          MS 600  
 Lbl                    London, British Library.  
                          Add. MS 4900                    <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800265419>  
                          Add. MS 5665  
                          Add. MS 10444                    <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800261277>  
                          Add. MS 10445                    <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800268745>  
                          Add. MSS 11585-8  
                          Add. MS 15117                    <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806466375>  
                          Add. MS 15118                    <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800268652>  
                          Add. MS 15166  
                          Add. MSS 17786-91                <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800265862>  
                          Add. MSS 17792-6                <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800271277>  
                          Add. MS 17801                    <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800265937>  
                          Add. MS 17850                    <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806426307>  
                          Add. MSS 18936-9                <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800268818>  
                          Add. MSS 18940-4                <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800261948>  
                          Add. MS 19759                    <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806426930>  
                          Add. MS 22100                    <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806426940>  
                          Add. MS 22597                    <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800268210>  
                          Add. MS 23779                    <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800268022>  
                          Add. MS 24357  
                          Add. MS 29246                    <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806045023>  
                          Add. MS 29247  
                          Add. MSS 29283-5                <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800261529>  
                          Add. MSS 29366-8                <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800265311>  
                          Add. MS 29290                    <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800265222>  
                          Add. MS 29369                    <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800261202>  
                          Add. MSS 29372-7                <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800267407>  
                          Add. MSS 29401-5                <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806048459>  
                          Add. MS 29427                    <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800268265>  
                          Add. MS 29996                    <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800268373>

Add. MS 30480-4	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800268818">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800268818</a>
Add. MS 30485	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/serach?id=806040354">https://opac.rism.info/serach?id=806040354</a>
Add. MS 30487	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800265363">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800265363</a>
Add. MS 30488-90	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800261794">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800261794</a>
Add. MSS 30826-8	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800265507">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800265507</a>
Add. MS 30930	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806040424">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806040424</a>
Add. MS 31390	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806039244">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806039244</a>
Add. MS 31392	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806047922">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806047922</a>
Add. MS 31422	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806931683">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806931683</a>
Add. MS 31423	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806931690">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806931690</a>
Add. MS 31424	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806932199">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806932199</a>
Add. MS 31425	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806932365">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806932365</a>
Add. MS 31426	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806932431">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806932431</a>
Add. MS 31427	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806932579">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806932579</a>
Add. MS 31428	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806932613">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806932613</a>
Add. MS 31429	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806932668">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806932668</a>
Add. MS 31430	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806932785">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806932785</a>
Add. MS 31431	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806932905">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806932905</a>
Add. MS 31432	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806350314">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806350314</a>
Add. MS 31440	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806933509">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806933509</a>
Add. MS 31531	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806045864">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806045864</a>
Add. MS 31532	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806045865">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806045865</a>
Add. MS 31697	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806046802">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806046802</a>
Add. MS 31698	
Add. MS 31902	
Add. MS 31922	
Add. MS 31987	
Add. MS 31992	
Add. MS 32157	
Add. MS 32158	
Add. MS 32317	
Add. MS 32347	
Add. MS 32377	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800271277">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800271277</a>
Add. MS 32533	
Add. MS 32991	
Add. MS 33295	
Add. MS 33296	
Add. MS 33933	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806039310">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806039310</a>
Add. MS 34049	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806039444">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806039444</a>
Add. MS 34050	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806039450">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806039450</a>
Add. MS 34800	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806037942">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806037942</a>
Add. MS 36993	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806038356">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806038356</a>
Add. MS 36484	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806039514">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806039514</a>
Add. MS 36526A	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806038298">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806038298</a>
Add. MS 36993	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806038356">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806038356</a>
Add. MSS 37402-6	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806039569">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806039569</a>
Add. MSS 39550-4	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806249845">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806249845</a>
Add. MSS 40657-61	

Add. MSS 41156-8	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806250102">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806250102</a>
Add. MS 47844	
Add. MS 49599	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806250187">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806250187</a>
Add. MS 56279	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806251415">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806251415</a>
Add. MS 59869	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806251652">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806251652</a>
Add. MS 62152A	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806251347">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806251347</a>
Add. MS 62152B	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806251347">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806251347</a>
Add. MS 64965	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806252218">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806252218</a>
Add. MS 75614	
Add. MS 75755	
Egerton 995	
Egerton 2009-12	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=000101782">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=000101782</a>
Egerton 2046	
Egerton 2485	
Egerton 2971	
Egerton 3665	
Harley 7578	
Hirsch M1353	
K.7.c.2	
Madrigal Society MSS G.33-6	
Madrigal Society MSS G.37-42	
R.M. 19.c.6	
R.M. 19.c.7	
R.M. 20.b.3	
R.M. 20.h.9	
R.M. 24.d.2	
R.M. 24.k.3	
R.M. 27.a.1-15	
Royal Appendix MSS 17-22	
Royal Appendix MSS 23-5	
Royal Appendix MS 55	
Royal Appendix MS 58	
Royal Appendix MSS 59-62	
Royal Appendix MSS 74-6	

Lcm                      London, Royal College of Music Library.

C41/1

MS 684

MS 767

MS 769

MS 794

MS 840

MS 870

MS 871

MS 872

MS 921

MS 1145

MS 1152

MS 1198(1)

MS 2036  
 MS 2039  
 MS 2041  
 MS 2049  
 MS 2059  
 MS 2089  
 MS 2090  
 MS 2093  
 MS 2231  
 MS 4341  
 Lgc London, Guildhall, Gresham Library.  
 MS 369  
 G. Mus. 469-71  
 Lhh ???  
 Lkc London, King's College [in the Strand].  
 MS 3  
 Llp London, Lambeth Palace Library  
 Lms London, Madrigal Society (deposited at Lbl)  
 Lpro London, Public Record Office.  
 Triplex SP 46/162  
 Lva London, Victoria and Albert Museum  
 Clement TT14-15  
 LI Lincoln, Cathedral Library.  
 Lu ???  
 LVp Liverpool, Public Libraries, Central Library.  
 MA Maidstone, Kent History Centre (formerly Kent Archives  
 Office)  
 MS U951/Z.23  
 Mch Manchester, Chetham's Library.  
 MS MUS A.2.6  
 Mp Manchester, Central Public Library, Henry Watson Collection  
 832.vu.51  
 NO Nottingham, University Library.  
 NTu Newcastle-upon-Tyne, University Library.  
 Bell-White MS 46  
 Leyden MS  
 Ob Oxford, Bodleian Library.  
 MS 1007  
 MS Digby 167  
 MS Mus. C.23  
 MS Mus. C.26  
 MS Mus. C.27  
 MSS Mus. E.1-5  
 MSS Mus. F.20-24  
 MS Mus. Sch. B.2  
 MS Mus. Sch. B.3  
 MS Mus. Sch. C.39  
 MS Mus. Sch. C.44

<https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800264016>  
<https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800262606>

MSS Mus. Sch. C.45-50	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800262815">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800262815</a>
MSS Mus. Sch. C.54-7	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800273150">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800273150</a>
MS Mus. Sch. C.58	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800273170">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800273170</a>
MSS Mus. Sch. C.59-60	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800262717">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800262717</a>
MS Mus. Sch. C.61	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800262818">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800262818</a>
MSS Mus. Sch. C.64-9	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806923918">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806923918</a>
MS Mus. Sch. C.70	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800263021">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800263021</a>
MS Mus. Sch. C.71	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800263062">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800263062</a>
MS Mus. Sch. C.77	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800273448">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800273448</a>
MS Mus. Sch. C.78	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800273456">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800273456</a>
MS Mus. Sch. C.80	
MS Mus. Sch. C.81	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800273464">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800273464</a>
MS Mus. Sch. C.82	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800273888">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800273888</a>
MS Mus. Sch. C.83	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800273493">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800273493</a>
MS Mus. Sch. C.84	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800271509">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800271509</a>
MS Mus. Sch. C.85	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800271512">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800271512</a>
MS Mus. Sch. C.86	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800273888">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800273888</a>
MS Mus. Sch. C.87	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800271522">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800271522</a>
MS Mus. Sch. C.88	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800273888">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800273888</a>
MS Mus. Sch. C.89	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800273907">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800273907</a>
MS Mus. Sch. C.90	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800273932">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800273932</a>
MS Mus. Sch. C.91	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800273957">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800273957</a>
MS Mus. Sch. C.92	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800273970">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800273970</a>
MS Mus. Sch. C.93	
MS Mus. Sch. C.98	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800271544">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800271544</a>
MS Mus. Sch. C.99	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800271577">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800271577</a> n
MS Mus. Sch. C.100	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800271598">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800271598</a>
MS Mus. Sch. C.101	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800271608">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800271608</a>
MS Mus. Sch. C.102	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800271627">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800271627</a>
MS Mus. Sch. C.131	
MS Mus. Sch. C.134	
MSS Mus. Sch. D.205-11	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800273125">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800273125</a>
MSS Mus. Sch. D.212-16	
MS Mus. Sch. D.217	
MS Mus. Sch. D.220	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800273888">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800273888</a>
MS Mus. Sch. D.221	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800271631">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800271631</a>
MS Mus. Sch. D.228	
MS Mus. Sch. D.229	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800273359">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800273359</a>
MS Mus. Sch. D.231	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800273235">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800273235</a>
MSS Mus. Sch. D.233-6	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800263552">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800263552</a>
MSS Mus. Sch. D.238-40	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800273324">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800273324</a>
MSS Mus. Sch. D.241-4	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800272284">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800272284</a>
MSS Mus. Sch. D.245-7	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800271631">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800271631</a>
MS Mus. Sch. D.249	
MS Mus. Sch. D.251	
MS Mus. Sch. D.252	
MS Mus. Sch. D.253	
MS Mus. Sch. D.254	



MS Mus. Sch. D.255  
 MS Mus. Sch. D.256  
 MS Mus. Sch. D.261 <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800272284>  
 MSS Mus. Sch. E.376-81  
 MS Mus. Sch. E.382 <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800273046>  
 MSS Mus. Sch. E.406-9 <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800262264>  
 MSS Mus. Sch. E.410-14 <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800272224>  
 MSS Mus. Sch. E.415-18 <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800273182>  
 MS Mus. Sch. E.423 <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=000101782>  
 MS Mus. Sch. E.428 <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800273136>  
 MSS Mus. Sch. E.431-6 <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800272139>  
 MSS Mus. Sch. E. 437-42 <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800272391>  
 MSS Mus. Sch. E.443-6 <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800272581>  
 MSS Mus. Sch. E.447-9 <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800272351>  
 MS Mus. Sch. E.450  
 MS Mus. Sch. E.451  
 MSS Mus. Sch. F.564-7 <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800272191>  
 MSS Mus. Sch. F.568-9 <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=800272472>  
 MS Mus. Sch. F.572  
 MS Mus. Sch. F.573  
 MS Mus. Sch. F.574  
 MS Mus. Sch. F.575  
 MS Mus. Sch. F.578  
 Printed book Mus. 184.c.8  
 MSS Tenbury 296-9  
 MS Tenbury 302  
 MS Tenbury 341-4  
 MSS Tenbury 354-8  
 MSS Tenbury 369-73  
 MSS Tenbury 379-84  
 MS Tenbury 389  
 MS Tenbury 745  
 MSS 807-11  
 MS Tenbury 1018  
 MS Tenbury 1309  
 MS Tenbury 1464  
 MSS Tenbury 1469-71

Och Oxford, Christ Church Library.

Mus 2  
 Mus 5  
 Mus 8  
 Mus 15  
 Mus 21  
 Mus 44  
 Mus 61-6  
 Mus 67  
 Mus 353-6  
 Mus 367-70

Mus 371  
Mus 379-81  
Mus 391-6  
Mus 397-400  
Mus 403-8  
Mus 409-10  
Mus 411-13  
Mus 414-16  
Mus 417-18  
Mus 419-22  
Mus 423-8  
Mus 430  
Mus 432  
Mus 433  
Mus 436  
Mus. 439  
Mus 459-62  
Mus 463-7  
Mus 468-72  
Mus 473-8  
Mus 479-83  
Mus 517-20  
Mus 527-30  
Mus. 531-2  
Mus 599  
Mus 612-13  
Mus 620  
Mus 716-20  
Mus 725-7  
Mus 728-30  
Mus 732-5  
Mus 744-6  
Mus 754-9  
Mus 772-6  
Mus 777-9  
Mus. 979-83  
Mus. 984-8  
Mus 1004  
Mus 1005  
Mus 1006-9  
Mus 1011  
Mus 1018-20  
Mus 1021  
Mus 1022  
Mus 1024  
Mus 1025-7  
Mus 1066  
Mus 1080

Mus 1113  
 Mus 1125  
 Mus 1180  
 Mus 1183  
 Mus 1185  
 Mus 1188-9  
 Mus 1236  
 Rr Reading, Berkshire CRO.  
 SA St Andrews University Library  
 T Tenbury, St. Michael's College (MSS now at Ob)  
 W Wells, Cathedral Library.  
 Vicars Choral Mus. Ms 4 <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806923968>  
 Vicars Choral Mus. Mss 5-6  
<https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806902112>  
 Vicars Choral Mus. Mss 7-8  
<https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806904607>  
 Vicars Choral Mus. Ms 9  
 Y York Minster Library  
 M3/1-4(S) <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806923935>  
 M 20(S) <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806923918>  
 M 56 <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806923931>  
 M 91(S)  
 St Aubyn MS

## **I-ITALY**

FZc Faenza, Biblioteca Comunale  
 117  
 Rc Rome, Biblioteca Casanatense  
 2856

## **IRL**

Dm Dublin, Archbishop Marsh's Library.  
 Z2.1.12  
 Z2.1.13  
 Z3.4.1-6 <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=866599233>  
 Z3.4.7-12  
 Z3.4.13  
 Z3.5.13  
 Z4.2.16  
 Dtc Dublin, Trinity College Library.  
 D.1.21/I  
 Press B.1.32

## **J-JAPAN**

Tn Tokyo, Tokyo Musashino Ongaku Daigaku

## **N-NORWAY**

Ou                      Oslo, Universitetsbiblioteket  
                          MS 294A  
 Tu                      Trondheim, Universitetsbiblioteket  
                          XA HA Mus. 1:1  
                          XA HA Mus. 1:2

## **NL-NETHERLANDS**

DHa                    K-XIX-1  
 DHgm                The Hague, Gemeente Museum  
                          MS 4.E.73  
 Lt                      Leiden, Bibliotheca Thysiana

## **PL-POLAND**

GD                    Gdansk, Biblioteka Polskiej, Akademii Nauk.  
 Lzu                    Lodz, Biblioteka Uniwersyteka.  
 PL-Wtm              Warsaw, Biblioteka Warszawskiego Towarzystwa Muzycznego

## **S-SWEDEN**

K                      Kalmar, Stifts –och Gymnasiebiblioteket.  
 (Kl)                   Kalmarlans Museum.  
                          MS 21.068  
 L                      Lund, Universitetsbiblioteket.  
                          MS G.28  
                          MS G.30  
                          MS G.34  
                          MS G.35  
 N                      Norrköping, Stadsbiblioteket  
                          9096-3  
 Skma                Stockholm, Kungliga Musikaliska akademiens biblioteket.  
                          Tablatur No. 3  
 Uu                      Uppsala, Universitetsbiblioteket.  
                          Caps. 64-5  
                          Imhs 001:004  
                          Imhs 001:005  
                          Imhs 001:006  
                          Imhs 001:007  
                          Imhs 001:008  
                          Imhs 001:009  
                          Imhs 001:011  
                          Imhs 003:002

Imhs 003:004  
Imhs 003:006  
Imhs 003:007  
Imhs 003:008  
Imhs 003:009  
Imhs 003:010  
Imhs 003:011  
Imhs 003:012  
Imhs 003:013  
Imhs 003:014  
Imhs 003:015  
Imhs 003:016  
Imhs 003:017  
Imhs 004:002  
Imhs 004:003  
Imhs 004:012  
Imhs 004:013  
Imhs 004:014  
Imhs 008:002.02  
Imhs 008:004  
Imhs 008:005  
Imhs 008:006  
Imhs 008:008  
Imhs 008:011  
Imhs 008:012  
Imhs 008:013  
Imhs 008:018  
Imhs 008:024  
Imhs 009:006  
Imhs 011:001  
Imhs 011:003  
Imhs 011:004  
Imhs 011:005  
Imhs 011:006  
Imhs 011:007  
Imhs 011:009  
Imhs 011:010  
Imhs 011:012  
Imhs 013:005  
Imhs 013:006  
Imhs 013:007  
Imhs 013:010  
Imhs 015:007  
Imhs 018:027  
Imhs 058:007  
Imhs 058:010  
Imhs 058:012  
Imhs 058:013

<https://opac.rism.info/searchid?=806250187>

## US-USA

Aau	Ann Arbor, University of Michigan
AUS	
	Finney 8 (9)
Bp	Boston, Mass., Public Library, Music Dept.
Bh	Boston, Harvard Music Association.
CA	Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Library.
	Mus 30 <a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=000101782">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=000101782</a>
	Mus 70
CLwr	Cleveland, Ohio, Western Reserve University Library.
	f.35v
Cn	Chicago, Newberry Library
	Case 6.A.143
	VM.1.A.18.J.52c
Cu	Chicago, University of Chicago Music Library
Lauc	Los Angeles, University of California, William Andrewes Clark Memorial Library.
	F.1994.M4 <a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=000137157">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=000137157</a>
	M286.M4.L992
NH	New Haven, Conn., Yale University, Library of the School of Music.
	Filmer 1 <a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=900000097">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=900000097</a>
	Filmer 2 <a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=900001635">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=900001635</a>
	Filmer 3 <a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=900000942">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=900000942</a>
	Filmer 4 <a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=900006000">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=900006000</a>
	Filmer 6 <a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=000105746">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=000105746</a>
	Filmer 7 <a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=900001907">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=900001907</a>
	Filmer 8 <a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=900000510">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=900000510</a>
	Filmer 9 <a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=900000802">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=900000802</a>
	Filmer 10 <a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=900001694">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=900001694</a>
	Filmer 11 <a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=900001712">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=900001712</a>
	Filmer 12 <a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=900001721">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=900001721</a>
	Filmer 13 <a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=900001739">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=900001739</a>
NHub	
	Osborn MS 16
	Osborn MS 515 <a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=900007775">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=900007775</a>
	digital copy at <a href="http://brbl-dl.library.yale.edu/vufind/Record/3435072">http://brbl-dl.library.yale.edu/vufind/Record/3435072</a>
Nyp	New York, Public Library (in the Lincoln Arts Center).
	Drexel 3551 <a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=000101912">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=000101912</a>
	Drexel 4061 <a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=000103358">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=000103358</a>
	Drexel 4175 <a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=000102959">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=000102959</a>
	Drexel 4180-5
	Drexel 4302 <a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=000103900">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=000103900</a>
	Drexel 5601
	Drexel 5609 <a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=000105070">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=000105070</a>

	Drexel 5612	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=000103683">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=000103683</a>
	Drexel 5624	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=000101760">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=000101760</a>
	Drexel 5871	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=000103361">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=000103361</a>
	MS JOG 72-50	
Oam	Oakland, Calif., Mills College.	
R	Rochester, New York State, Eastman School of Music, Sibley Music Library.	
	M350.F216	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=000130150">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=000130150</a>
	ML96 L814f	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=000131770">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=000131770</a>
SM	San Marino, Huntington Library.	
	EL 25A 46-51	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=000100621">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=000100621</a>
U	Urbana, University of Illinois, Music Library.	
	Q763 P699C	
Wc	Washington, Library of Congress.	
	M990.C66F4	<a href="https://opac.rism.info/search?id=000141343">https://opac.rism.info/search?id=000141343</a>
Ws	Washington, Folger Shakespeare Library.	
	M2,1,T2	
	Va 405-7	
	Va 408	
	Va 412	
	Vb 280	

## **RUS-USSR**

SPan	St Petersburg, Bibliotka Rossijskoj akademii nauk
	MS O N° 124

## REVIEW ARTICLE

*Leipzig Church Music from the Sherard Collection:  
Eight Works by Sebastian Knüpfer, Johann Schelle, and Johann Kubnau,*  
ed. Stephen Rose, Collegium Musicum Yale University, second series, vol. 20  
(A-R Editions: Middleton WI, 2014)

PETER HOLMAN

There are two reasons why this edition is of interest to members of the Viola da Gamba Society, and therefore deserves to be reviewed here. First, it makes available some rewarding pieces of Leipzig church music by three of J.S. Bach's predecessors at the Thomaskirche in Leipzig, most if not all of which can be performed using one or more viols. Second, it throws new light on James Sherard and his collection, well known to gamba players for the manuscripts it contains of solo viol music, including copies of at least 18 pieces by Gottfried Finger and several manuscripts of Lübeck provenance that contain sonatas or suites by Dieterich Buxtehude, Johann Schenck, Peter Grecke, Johann Martin Radeck and David Adam Baudringer.<sup>1</sup>

### *James Sherard and his Collection*

To take the second point first: James Sherard (1666-1738) is mainly known to musicians today as an accomplished amateur composer, the author of two sets of Corellian trio sonatas (1701 and 1715-16), though he was an apothecary by profession, with a successful business in London, and he was also a botanist – an interest he shared with his brother William. The late Margaret Crum was the first to work out how Sherard's collection ended up in the Music School Collection of the Bodleian Library in Oxford: it seems to have been sold after his death in 1738 (or perhaps his wife's death in 1741) to the clergyman and antiquarian Richard Rawlinson, whose vast collection of manuscripts was acquired by the Bodleian after his own death in 1755. Crum began the task of identifying Sherard's collection. She only ever published one short article on a small aspect of the subject,<sup>2</sup> though the Bodleian Library has the typescript of a more wide-ranging

---

1 Modern editions include P. Grecke, *Two Suites (D major & E major) for Two Bass Viols*, ed. D. Beecher (Hannacroix NY, 1998); D. Buxtehude, *Violadagamba Solo: Sonata D-Dur für Viola a Gamba und Basso Continuo BuxWV 268*, ed. G. and L. von Zadow (Heidelberg, 2005); *Three 'Stylus Phantasticus' Sonatas for Bass Viol and B.C. by Baudringer, Radeck & Anon.*, ed. S. Heinrich (Oxford, 2005); *Lübecker Violadagamba Solo: Sonata D-moll für Viola da Gamba und Basso Continuo eines unbekannten Meisters*, 2. Hälfte 17. Jahrhundert, ed. G. and L. von Zadow (Heidelberg, 2006); G. Finger, *The Music for Solo Viol*, ed. R. Rawson and P. Wagner (Twickenham, 2009).

2 M. Crum, 'Music from St Thomas's, Leipzig, in the Music School Collection at Oxford', *Festschrift Rudolf Ehlers zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. E. Hertrich and H. Schneider (Tübingen, 1985), 97-101.



lecture on the collection she gave in Oxford in 1982,<sup>3</sup> and much of her research is set out in the files of Revised Descriptions of Music School manuscripts in the Music Reading Room of the Bodleian, MUS.AC.4; her work has subsequently been built upon by Peter Wollny, Robert Rawson and others.<sup>4</sup> It is now apparent that, in addition to manuscripts copied in England by Sherard and his associates, his collection includes sets of parts from Rome, Stuttgart, Leipzig and Lübeck (including the copies of viol music already mentioned), as well as many sets of printed instrumental ensemble music, mostly published in Bologna and Venice.

A number of scholars have wondered how an amateur musician in London managed to acquire manuscripts from right across continental Europe. It has long been suspected that some or all of the Italian manuscripts and prints were brought back to England by William Sherard, who went on the grand tour in the late 1690s with Wriothesley Russell, later second Duke of Bedford. Margaret Crum suggested that James Sherard either obtained the German manuscripts from his brother (Russell's grand tour took in Germany) or from the composer J.W. Franck, who settled in London around 1690; the collection includes a piece by Franck. The problem with this is that Wollny established that Sherard's collection of German manuscripts was assembled some time after Franck arrived in London, this is between about 1690 and 1710, which led me to suggest an alternative: that Gottfried Finger might have been the supplier, either in person before he left England in 1701 or through intermediaries or by post from Germany afterwards.<sup>5</sup> Rawson showed that some of the copies of Finger's bass viol pieces in Sherard's collection are in the composer's autograph, and that the two men sometimes collaborated in their copying, suggesting a master-pupil relationship.

However, Stephen Rose throws new light on the problem in his comprehensive introduction because he has examined the correspondence of the Sherard brothers, the first musicologist to do so. He reveals that they were members of a network of botanists and collectors across Europe and beyond (including Aleppo in Syria and Charleston in South Carolina) who regularly corresponded to exchange scientific news, botanical specimens and collectors' items such as medals, manuscripts and rare books. Furthermore, both brothers travelled on the Continent a number of times, and William acted as an agent for English collectors, supplying the antiquarian Humphrey Wanley (and his patron Robert Harley, Earl of Oxford) with rare books and manuscripts – including music. Thus James

---

3 M. Crum, 'James Sherard and the Oxford Music School Collection', typescript of a lecture given to the Oxford Bibliographical Society, February 1982; I am grateful to Peter Ward-Jones, former Music Librarian of the Bodleian Library, for providing me with a copy.

4 P. Wollny, 'A Collection of Seventeenth-Century Vocal Music at the Bodleian Library', *Schütz-Jahrbuch*, 15 (1993), 77-108; R.G. Rawson, 'From Olomouc to London: The Early Music of Gottfried Finger (c.1655-1730)', Ph.D. diss. (Royal Holloway, U. of London, 2002), esp. 37-42.

5 P. Holman, *Life after Death: The Viola da Gamba in Britain from Purcell to Dolmetsch* (Woodbridge, 2010), 78-80.

Sherard could have acquired his German music manuscripts in a number of ways: in person on his travels, through his brother, or through book dealers on the Continent.

Nevertheless, in my opinion Finger remains the prime suspect as the agent (or one of the agents) of transmission. To borrow the terminology of the detective novel, he is the prime suspect because he had the means – his demonstrable connection with Sherard – and the opportunity – his later peripatetic career. After leaving London in 1701 he ranged across German-speaking Europe, from Berlin and Breslau in the north to Vienna, Innsbruck, Heidelberg and Mannheim in the south; he died in Mannheim in 1730. Most important, perhaps, is Finger's close connection with Estienne Roger in Amsterdam, the leading music seller in the Netherlands, with his own network of connections across Germany. Roger published Finger's six numbered collections as well as many other pieces by him in anthologies.<sup>6</sup> Finger would certainly have had the motive to organise the sending of German manuscripts to Sherard: he doubtless would have been well rewarded by the wealthy apothecary and botanist.

What is still unexplained, despite Stephen Rose's research, is why James Sherard acquired a collection of nearly 50 sets of performance parts of Lutheran church music from various parts of Germany – including the eight pieces from Leipzig in this edition.<sup>7</sup> They use the typical German format of a wrapper (often also serving as the continuo part) enclosing a set of mostly single vocal and instrumental parts. The sets were originally loose-leaf, each containing the parts for a single piece, though in the nineteenth century the Bodleian bound them higgledy-piggledy fashion into five volumes, now MSS Mus. Sch. C. 28-31 and C. 43. Rose follows Wollny in suggesting that the collection, in whole or in part, may have been in the possession of Jacob Pagendarm, cantor of the Marienkirche in Lübeck and long-serving colleague of Buxtehude, its organist. Thus it may only have left Germany after Pagendarm's death in 1706.

To judge from the number of English manuscripts of trio sonatas and other instrumental ensemble music by composers such as Antonio Bertali and Johann Heinrich Schmelzer (Vienna), William Young (Innsbruck), Johann Michael Nicolai (Stuttgart), Balthasar Richardt, Philippe van Wichel and Giuseppe Zamponi (the Spanish Netherlands), Dietrich Becker (Hamburg), Nathaniel Schnittelbach (Danzig) and Clamor Heinrich Abel (Hannover), there was considerable interest in instrumental music from northern and central Europe among Restoration musicians – something that Rose might have pointed out.<sup>8</sup> However, these pieces

---

6 See the list in R. Rasch, *The Music Publishing House of Estienne Roger and Michel-Charles Le Cène 1696-1743*, part iv: *Catalogue D'Alay-Fux* [<http://www.let.uu.nl/~Rudolf.Rasch/personal/Roger/Catalogue-Dalay-Fux.pdf>], 44-52.

7 There is an inventory in Wollny, 'A Collection of Seventeenth-Century Vocal Music', 99-108.

8 For English manuscripts of continental sonatas, see esp. M. Caudle, 'The English Repertory for Violin, Bass Viol and Continuo', *Chebyx*, 6 (1975-6), 69-75; R. Thompson, 'Some Late Sources of

were copied into conventional sets of part-books, often alongside English pieces using the same scorings. Sherard seems to have been in a minority of one among English musicians at the time, amateur or professional, in developing an interest in Lutheran church music and in collecting original sets of performing material for it. There are other manuscripts of German church music in British libraries, though they are in score rather than parts and seem to have arrived here by accident or as part of much larger collections.

For example, the two large scores of concerted church music by Johann Pachelbel often said to be in the composer's autograph, now Bodleian Library, MSS Tenbury 1208 and 1209 (there are also two single scores of Magnificat settings in the same hand, Tenbury MSS 1311 and 1356), were certainly in England by 1779 because they were in the collection of William Boyce, sold in April that year.<sup>9</sup> An obvious route from Nuremberg (where Pachelbel died in 1706) to London would have been in the luggage of his son Karl Theodor (1690-1750), who settled in Charleston, South Carolina in 1733, apparently after spending some time in England; perhaps he sold them to a London bookseller or collector to help pay his passage to America.

A more substantial collection now forms five British Library volumes, R.M.24.a.1-5. It consists of scores of mostly large-scale settings of Latin church music by German composers or Italians working in Germany or the Spanish Netherlands, including Johann Rosenmüller (Venice and then Wolfenbüttel), Johann Hugo Wilderer and Carlo Luigi Pietragnua (Düsseldorf), Ruggiero Fedeli (Hanover and then Kassel), and Pietro Torri (Brussels). It seems to have formed part of the oldest layer of the Royal Music Library, which otherwise consists mainly of scores and parts of operas and vocal chamber music by Agostino Steffani; the collection was apparently brought to England as part of the possessions of Georg Ludwig, Elector of Hanover, who became George I in 1714.<sup>10</sup> Steffani was Kapellmeister at Hanover from 1688 to 1703, eventually settling there in 1709 as Bishop of Spiga *in partes infidelium* and apostolic vicar with a mission to reconvert northern

---

Music by John Jenkins', *John Jenkins and his Time: Studies in English Consort Music*, ed. A. Ashbee and P. Holman (Oxford, 1996), 271-307. For the early history of the sonata in England, see *Restoration Trio Sonatas*, ed. P. Holman and J. Cunningham, Purcell Society Companion Series, 4 (London, 2012), xi-xv.

9 The contents of the manuscripts are listed briefly in J.M. Perreault, *The Thematic Catalogue of the Musical Works of Johann Pachelbel* (Lanham MD, 2004), 288-9; R.J. Bruce and H.D. Johnstone, 'A Catalogue of the Truly Valuable and Curious Library of Music Late in the Possession of Dr. William Boyce (1779): Transcription and Commentary', *RMA Research Chronicle*, 43 (2010), 111-71, at 154-5.

10 For the collection, see esp. C. Timms, 'Gregorio Piva and Steffani's Principal Copyist', *Source Materials and the Interpretation of Music: A Memorial Volume to Thurston Dart*, ed. I. Bent (London, 1981), 169-90.

Germany and Scandinavia from Protestantism;<sup>11</sup> he had turned in mid-career from music to the life of a diplomat and a senior Catholic priest. I have long wondered whether the contents of the five volumes were collected and copied to provide music for the Catholic chapel Steffani planned to establish in Hanover. Most of the composers had some sort of personal connection with the musical bishop, while Wolfenbüttel, where Rosenmüller had died in 1684, is only about 50 miles from Hanover. It is easy to imagine Steffani sending a servant there to copy suitable pieces from Rosenmüller's autographs, now long lost.

I digress, but I hope that, by drawing attention to these two other caches of German church music in English libraries, it will prompt others to investigate Anglo-German musical connections at a period just before the trickle of German musicians arriving in London became a flood. My digression also serves to emphasise the unique nature of Sherard's collection of German church music. As the Pachelbel and Steffani-related volumes show, by the early eighteenth century it was becoming routine to use scores rather than parts to preserve and study music of all types, and scores were much more convenient than sets of loose-leaf parts for travelling or for sending music by post, for the obvious reasons that the loss of a single part could render a whole set useless and works already in score did not have to be scored up to become intelligible.

On the face of it, the fact that James Sherard collected German church music in sets of performing parts suggests that he planned to have some of them performed, though many of them use cornetts and sackbuts, instruments that had passed out of use at the English court (and other elite musical circles, presumably) around 1670.<sup>12</sup> Also, the pieces are mostly written in a style that would have struck most English musicians around 1710 as ridiculously old fashioned, though, as Rose points out, that of course might have been an attraction for Sherard, given that this was the period when there were the first stirrings of interest among English musicians in collecting and copying old music – effectively the beginning of the early music movement.<sup>13</sup> Furthermore, as the facsimiles printed by Wollny and Rose show, even the most neatly written Latin-texted pieces would have given English musicians pause for thought, so different were the habits of German and English copyists at the time, and one can only imagine English singers trying to decipher German texts written in *Kurrentschrift* – the Germanic form of the crabbed Gothic script known in England as secretary hand and reserved mainly for legal documents.

---

11 See esp. C. Timms, *Polymath of the Baroque: Agostino Steffani and his Music* (Oxford, 2003), 101-7.

12 See P. Holman, *Four and Twenty Fiddlers: The Violin at the English Court 1540-1690* (Oxford, 2/1995), 393-8.

13 See esp. W. Weber, *The Rise of Musical Classics in Eighteenth-Century England: A Study in Canon, Ritual, and Ideology* (Oxford, 1992), 1-56.

I have already mentioned that James Sherard copied gamba music and seems to have been a pupil of Gottfried Finger, so we can presume that he played the viol as well as the violin – a common pairing among English amateurs at the time.<sup>14</sup> Stephen Rose even suggests in his introduction that Sherard might have been particularly interested in collecting Lutheran works with obbligato gamba parts. One of them in this edition, Johann Kuhnau's 'Laudate pueri' (no. 7), is scored for solo tenor, two scordatura violins, obbligato 'Trombone ô Viola da Gamba' and continuo, while according to Wollny's inventory there are five others in the collection with gamba parts: an anonymous setting of 'Lobe den Herrn meine Seele' for two sopranos, two 'Viol d'gamba' and continuo in MS Mus. Sch. C. 43; and four works by the Stuttgart composer Samuel Capricornus: settings of 'Laetare Jesusalem' (soprano or tenor, 'Trombono o Violdigamb' and continuo) and 'Jesu nostra Redemptio' (soprano, 'Viola da Gamba' and continuo) in MS Mus. Sch. C.28; and 'Arma militiae nostrae' (bass, 'Viola di gamba' and continuo) and 'Dominus illuminatio' (two basses, 'Viol di Gamba' or 'Fagotto' and continuo in MS Mus. Sch. C. 29.<sup>15</sup> So far as I know none of these pieces have yet appeared in modern editions, and to judge from the printed collections and manuscripts of individual pieces recently made available in digital form on the IMSLP/Petrucchi website,<sup>16</sup> Capricornus had a particular interest in the gamba and would repay further investigation by editors and players.

### *The Edition*

This brings me at last to Stephen Rose's edition and the music it contains. As already mentioned, it contains eight pieces from the Sherard collection by three of J.S. Bach's Leipzig predecessors; in listing their scorings I quote from Rose's detailed description of the original parts in his Critical Report whenever the identity of the stringed instruments is in doubt. There are two large-scale pieces by Sebastian Knüpfer (1633-76): settings of the psalms 'De profundis' (no. 1) and 'Lauda Jerusalem' (no. 2), the former scored for SSATB solo voices, SATB ripieno voices, four inner parts marked 'Viola' (but described as '2 Violin' and '3 viol' on the wrapper), 'Fagotto' and continuo ('Violon' and 'Organo'), the latter for SATB voices solo and ripieno, 2 violins, 3 inner parts marked 'Viola', 'Fagotto', 'Violon' and 'Organo'.

Next are three large-scale pieces by Johann Schelle (1648-1701): a setting of the Latin hymn 'Salve solis orientis' (no. 3) for SSATB solo voices, 'Clarino piccolo', 2 *cornettini*, 3 trombones, 2 violins, two inner parts marked 'Viola', and continuo; a vocal concerto using the German chorale 'Durch Adams fall' (no. 4), scored for

---

14 See, for instance, the survey of amateur gamba players around 1700 in Holman, *Life after Death*, 57-82.

15 Wollny, 'A Collection of Seventeenth-Century Vocal Music', 101-3, 105.

16 [http://imslp.org/wiki/Category:Capricornus,\\_Samuel](http://imslp.org/wiki/Category:Capricornus,_Samuel).

SSATB solo voices, 2 violins, two inner parts marked 'Viola', 2 *cornettini*, 3 trombones and 'Organo'; and a setting of the Magnificat (no. 5), scored for SSATB voices solo and ripieno, 2 *cornettini*, 3 trombones, 2 violins, two inner parts marked 'Viola', and two marked 'Organo' – one figured and one unfigured, the latter probably intended for a bassoonist or string bass player. Schelle's contribution to the volume is completed by a small-scale vocal concerto, 'Ah! quam multa sunt peccata' (no. 6), scored for solo alto, two violins and 'Cembalo'. Finally, there are two small-scale pieces by Johann Kuhnau (1660-1722), J.S. Bach's immediate predecessor in Leipzig: the setting of the psalm 'Laudate pueri' already described (no. 7) and the cantata 'Muss nicht der Mensch' (no. 8), scored for tenor solo, trumpet, violin, 'Fagotto' and 'Continuo', labelled more specifically as 'Organo' in a German concordance.

Mention of concordances brings me to another important feature of the Sherard collection: of the eight pieces in Rose's edition, five (nos. 1-4 and 6) no longer survive in German sources (though Knüpfer's 'De profundis' is listed in a late seventeenth-century inventory from Querfurt near Halle), and only Schelle's Magnificat might be described as widely dispersed: it appears in an inventory from Schweinfurt near Würzburg (Rose is impressively good at ferreting out these ghostly sources), as well as in a late copy now in Berlin that was offered for sale in 1769 by the Leipzig music seller Johann Gottlob Immanuel Breitkopf – a remarkable testament to the music's staying power at a time when seventeenth-century music was generally regarded as an archaic curiosity at best. Furthermore, Rose shows in detail how J.S. Bach must have had access to a copy of Schelle's Magnificat, for he used the same vocal scoring (SSATB), followed its outline planning and even allowed it to influence details of the vocal writing of his own Magnificat, written for Christmas 1723, shortly after he had succeeded Kuhnau in Leipzig. Bach's setting is of course much more modern in most other respects, particularly in its use of the orchestra.

I do not need to say much more about the music in the edition, except that James Sherard would have found all the pieces well worth performing, had he been able to get musicians together with sufficient expertise to do them justice, and they all deserve to find their way into concert programmes and recordings today. However, A-R's marketing policy does not exactly encourage performances. It sells instrumental parts for the three pieces for solo voice, but not separate scores, which presumably means that singers are expected to buy the whole volume (currently costing \$225) just to obtain a single piece and to sing holding a heavy book; separate scores would also be easier to use on the music desks of continuo instruments. Parts for the larger pieces are only available on hire, which is also unfortunate: these days early music groups prefer to buy their own material, which they can then mark up as they want and use repeatedly if necessary. A-R has some way to go if it wants to compete with the 'cottage industry' publishers who cater for early music groups. They routinely sell parts rather than hiring them out – an outmoded commercial model, in my opinion – and they are prepared to produce material tailored to individual needs, with separate scores where necessary and

'kits' providing all the material needed for a historically informed performance of particular works.

Reading through the volume, I was most struck by the pieces by Johann Schelle, a much neglected predecessor of Bach, ripe for rediscovery. Thanks to Stephen Rose we were able to try out a pre-publication version of Schelle's Magnificat during the 2015 Cambridge Early Music Baroque Summer School, and I can thoroughly recommend it as a worthy predecessor of Bach's setting; it would be interesting to hear them performed together in the same concert. I was also struck by Schelle's innovative setting of 'Durch Adams fall'. As Rose points out, it is one of the first pieces of the type familiar to us from Bach's cantatas in which traditional chorale settings frame more modern recitative- and aria-like passages.

However, it is inevitable that the three pieces for solo voice will be performed most often. Schelle's 'Ah! quam multa sunt peccata' is a large-scale vocal concerto, expressive and virtuosic by turns. It would make a wonderful recital piece for a countertenor (the range is *g-c''*), though it was probably originally sung by an adolescent boy chorister or possibly even by an alto castrato passing through Leipzig or visiting from nearby Dresden. Kuhnau's setting of the psalm 'Laudate pueri' would also make a fine recital piece for an accomplished tenor, though it is perhaps more remarkable for its instrumental parts. In addition to the obbligato tenor-range part, scored for trombone or bass viol in the Sherard manuscript but given the extra option of a violoncello in a later Berlin score, there are two *scordatura* violin parts. They are for violins tuned a semitone higher than normal (*a flat – e' flat – b' flat – f''*), so that they play in the grateful and brilliant key of A major while the voice and other instruments are in B flat major. They might have been intended for instruments kept tuned a semitone lower than *Cornet-ton*, the prevailing organ pitch in Leipzig, which was about a semitone above modern pitch in Kuhnau's time.<sup>17</sup> However, Rose quotes (p. xxi) from a letter Kuhnau wrote in 1717 explaining that he had tried to abolish *Cornet-ton* in Leipzig in favour of *Cammer-ton*, 'which is a second or minor third lower, depending on which is convenient', so it may be that the violins were tuned at *a'* = 392 Hz. while the other instruments were at our familiar 'Baroque pitch' of *a'* = 415 Hz. Incidentally, it is a pity that the violin parts are only given at sounding pitch in the score, with the *scordatura* notation relegated to the parts. It would have been useful and good to have the *scordatura* and sounding-pitch parts printed side-by-side in the score. Kuhnau's 'Muss nicht der Mensch' is an up-to-the-minute solo cantata for tenor, accompanied by virtuosic parts for solo trumpet in C and violin with *fagotto* and continuo. I wonder whether Sherard was attracted to this fine piece because he knew the innovative sonatas Finger had written in London in the 1690s scored respectively for trumpet, oboe and continuo RI170, trumpet or oboe, violin and continuo RI171, and trumpet, violin, oboe and continuo RI202.<sup>18</sup>

---

17 B. Haynes, *A History of Performing Pitch: The Story of 'A'* (Lanham MD, 2002), 214-15, 239.

18 Rawson, 'From Olomouc to London', 230, 246.

I will leave it to experts on seventeenth-century German church music to pronounce on the wider aspects of Stephen Rose's work, though it strikes me as one of the best editions of the repertory I have come across. It really does provide 'a basis for practical performance' (with the reservations I have expressed about A-R's marketing policy) as well as presenting 'an accurate and scholarly presentation of the original texts', to quote the formula used in current *Musica Britannica* volumes. I have used it constantly over the last few months, and have yet to spot an obvious error in the musical text, a tribute to Rose's scholarly and musical acumen and a rarity today when inadequate copy-editing and rushed proof-reading have unfortunately become the norm. Furthermore, Rose's introduction, as readers will have gathered, covers every aspect of the source, the collection, the composers, the music and its German sources, the liturgical context, the connection with J.S. Bach, and questions of performance practice. It has the advantage of introducing English readers painlessly to a range of recent German scholarship, often in obscure journals. Rose is a rare example of a musicologist working in the period who is equally comfortable with German and English sources. He has mostly written about German music but is also the author of an authoritative survey of performance practice issues in Purcell,<sup>19</sup> and he is the only person known to me who could have pulled together all the diverse historical, musical and linguistic threads needed to produce a successful edition of music from James Sherard's fascinating collection of Lutheran church music.

### *Questions of String Scoring*

I would like to end this review with a discussion of several issues of string scoring arising from the edition and of interest to members of the Viola da Gamba Society. As will be apparent from my listing of the scoring of the pieces, some of them have only a single bass part marked *organo* while others have additional bass parts marked *fagotto* or *violon*. This is a familiar situation, also found for instance in Telemann's ensemble suites with two or three oboes, bassoon, strings and continuo. As Rose points out, the simplest explanation is that in some circumstances separate bass parts were not produced because the string bass player or bassoonist looked over the shoulder of the continuo player, a practice often seen in contemporary pictures and well established in other genres, such as Italian opera. Where separate bass parts are lacking, as in the Sherard parts for all of the Schelle pieces in the edition, it is an easy matter to produce them following the practice of the period: they should play only in tutti sections and/or when the upper instruments are playing, dropping out in the passages for solo voices and continuo. I hope that A-R's instrumental parts (which I have not seen) follow this convention.

---

19 S. Rose, 'Performance Practices', *The Ashgate Research Companion to Henry Purcell*, ed. R. Herissone (Farnham, 2012), 115-64.



As to the identity of the *violon* or *violone* in seventeenth-century Leipzig, it was common in the early stages of the modern revival of seventeenth-century German church music to assume that it was a contrabass of some sort and that the *organo* part needed to be doubled throughout by a bass viol or violoncello, as in eighteenth-century practice. This assumption was also encouraged by the use of small box organs too weak to be used for continuo without reinforcing bass instruments. As so often with performance practice problems, one compromise – the use of small portable organs – leads to another – the continuous use of doubling bass instruments. The continuo parts of these pieces would originally have been played on powerful church organs, perfectly adequate to accompany solo sections without reinforcement, though as Rose points out (p. xxiv) there is evidence for plucked instruments in Leipzig church music, including the theorbo and the *colochon* or *calichon*, a type of bass lute also known as the mandora. Rose also shows that the old tradition of bass instruments dropping in and out of the texture was changing in the late seventeenth century – as it was elsewhere – to the eighteenth-century practice of continuous doubling.<sup>20</sup>

Rose quotes Martin Heinrich Fuhrmann, writing in 1706, to the effect that a *Violone grosso*, an octave bass violin, ‘should profitably be present in all churches, to underpin not only the concerted music but also the chorales’ (p. xxv). However, he does not discuss the two ordinary types of *violone*, as described for instance by Daniel Merck in 1695.<sup>21</sup> One was a large six-string bass viol tuned in *AA* or *GG*, a fourth or fifth lower than the ordinary type, and the other a four-string ‘Französisches Bass’ or bass violin tuned *BB flat* – *F* – *c* – *g*. It has become common in recent years to perform the *violone* parts of Buxtehude and his contemporaries on large viols, though the fact that the parts never go below *CC* rather suggests that the four-string bass violin was the normal choice, though tuned like the modern violoncello – a tuning listed by Michael Praetorius as early as 1619.<sup>22</sup> To judge from the range of the bass parts in this edition, it was also the first choice in Leipzig. This is not to say that large bass viols were never used, or that double basses did not reinforce large ensembles, but in my opinion *violone* parts were normally played on a four-string bass violin tuned in *C* and playing mostly at written pitch.

Finally, we need to consider the meaning of the word *viola* in this repertory. It was mostly used for inner string parts, though in Knüpfer’s ‘De profundis’ it is used for all five parts: the four upper parts were labelled *viola* 1-4 and the *violone* was

---

20 For this issue in English music, see P. Holman, ‘Original Sets of Parts for Restoration Concerted Music at Oxford’, *Performing the Music of Henry Purcell*, ed. M. Burden (Oxford, 1996), 9-19, at 16-18.

21 D. Merck, *Compendium musicae instrumentalis chelicae* (Augsburg, 1695), sig. Cs [http://www.greatbassviol.com/treat/merck.pdf].

22 For a discussion of this issue in Buxtehude, see P. Holman, ‘Buxtehude on CD: A Tercentenary Survey’, *Early Music*, 35 (2007), 385-96, at 388.

included in the description of the scoring on the wrapper of the parts as ‘2 Violin / 3 Viol’. Rose interprets this to mean that the work was originally written for four violas and bass and that the wrapper (in a different hand) ‘updates the scoring for modern tastes’. However, it was common in the seventeenth century to use *viola* in a collective sense to mean several sizes of the violin family, and I think it is more likely that the wrapper just describes the scoring more accurately than the labels on the parts.

Having said that, the attractive combination of four violas and continuo is occasionally found in German church music – J.S. Bach’s Cantata no. 18, ‘Gleichwie der Regen und Schnee von Himmel fällt’, written in 1714, is a late example – and in fact the upper parts in ‘De profundis’ do not go out of first position on the viola. Furthermore, as Rose points out, another alternative is a complete viol consort, used at the time particularly for laments and by extension for penitential texts such as the ‘De profundis’. However, it is worth pointing out that the least likely option, despite its popularity today, is a mixed ensemble consisting of violins on the top parts and viols on the lower parts. Combining the two families in this way seems to have been rare in seventeenth-century Germany, and when composers wanted to do so they usually signified their intentions by adding the qualifier *da gamba* to the *viola* parts, as in Kuhnau’s ‘Laudate pueri’. The norm in Leipzig, as elsewhere in Germany, was a five-part violin-family ensemble consisting of two violins, two violas and bass, though bass parts were often allocated to a *fagotto* presumably because it took up less space in cramped church galleries than bowed instruments and projected more effectively over their parapets.

### *Conclusion*

The length of this review – and much more could be said – is a testament to the importance of this edition and Sherard’s fascinating collection. Stephen Rose’s exemplary Introduction and Critical Report will be read and used with profit by anyone interested in music and musical life in seventeenth-century Germany and England – and the complex relationships between them. Most important, the edition makes eight fine works available in print for the first time. They deserve to be widely performed and recorded, and I hope that A-R will change their marketing policy to enable that to happen.

Louis Couperin  
The Extant Works for Wind or String Instruments

Edited by Mary Cyr  
The Broude Trust, New York, 2015  
ISBN 0-8450-7270-6  
Score and parts: \$60.00; Score: \$30.00

PIA PIRCHER

Score: 20 pages introduction + 57 pages

Parts: Dessus (treble clef), Haut-Contre (treble and alto clef), Taille (alto clef),  
Quinte (alto clef), Basse (bass clef)

Content:

1. *Fantaisie*
2. *Autre fantaisie*
3. *Fantaisie sur le Jeu des hautbois*
4. *Fantaisie sur le mesme Jeu*
5. *Simphonie par M<sup>r</sup>. Couperin*
6. *Fantaisie pour les Violes par M<sup>r</sup>. Couperin*
7. *Fantaisie de Violes par M<sup>r</sup>. Couperin*
8. *Simphonie par M<sup>r</sup>. Couperin*
9. *Simphonie par M<sup>r</sup>. Couperin*

This new edition by Mary Cyr for the *Broude Trust* features nine pieces by Louis Couperin (1726 – 1761) for consorts of wind and string instruments. Louis Couperin, remembered as the first in the distinguished line of Couperins, is today known for more than two hundred compositions in several manuscripts which were principally written for harpsichord and organ. Being a pupil of the famous harpsichordist Jacques Champion de Chambonnières (1601 – 1672), Couperin was well known by his contemporaries as a gifted harpsichord player and was appointed *ordinaire de la Musique de la Chambre* for the treble viol at the royal court. This position, as Titon du Tillet tells us, was created just for famous performers. Louis Couperin's career ended very early; he died aged 35. Nevertheless his *oeuvre* contains an impressive volume of pieces, fundamental for the development of the French harpsichord school.

Mary Cyr has now made available nine pieces in score and parts, which are all found in the keyboard manuscripts of Bauyn and Oldham. As she explains in her introduction, they are problematic because they are partly transmitted in reduced score, making the instrumentation uncertain

Four of the pieces are in five parts and titled *fantaisie*; they are unique to the Oldham manuscript. Mary Cyr's introduction records the original scoring in a three staves system, with the top stave carrying two voices in the G2 clef. The pieces are entered as two pairs: the first pair, Nos. 1 and 2 in the present edition, are not attributed to specific instruments, but the range of the parts suits a consort of stringed instruments. The second pair of *fantaisies* is titled *sur le jeu des hautbois* and both pieces are dated 1654. The editor suggests that this heading could point to an organ oboe stop as well as to performance by a woodwind consort. These four pieces are the only ones in five parts by Louis

Couperin. The relationship between *dessus* and *bass* is especially interesting. The *parties de remplissage* support the *dessus* in this homophonic texture, using intervals of thirds, sixths, tenths; an effect of a trio texture is created. The frequent changes of texture and metre suggest that these pieces would be suitable for theatrical presentations. Rhythmically there is an evident difference between the (untitled) string and (titled) wind pieces, as the latter more often feature repeated notes and dotted rhythms, giving them a ceremonial character.

The Bauyn manuscript is divided into three parts: the first section devoted to harpsichord pieces by Chambonnières, the second to Louis Couperin's keyboard music and the third contains pieces by various composers. The five pieces in this edition are all from the third section of the manuscript and are signed with the name of Couperin. Only No. 5 *Simphonie par M<sup>r</sup>. Couperin* is written out with three individual parts. The other four pieces are transmitted in a reduced score representing *dessus* and *basse*. Whereas No. 6 and 7 give just a sprinkling of *basse-continue* figures, in No. 9 figures and indications of inner parts can be found. Reduced scores were often written in France in the late seventeenth century. As the texture often avoids counterpoint or any extensive imitation, the inner parts lend themselves to improvisation by the performers. Mary Cyr offers in the appendix of the score, and in the parts, a possible realisation of those pieces in reduced score.

All nine pieces of this present edition are transmitted in keyboard manuscripts and so may be played on keyboard instruments, especially the organ, but they are more probably intended for instrumental ensembles. There is something of a French tradition of representing music for string or wind instruments in keyboard format, such as François Couperin's *Les Goûts réunis* for example. But the possibility of performing these pieces on string or wind instruments can also be found in some of the titles. Certain instruments were associated with particular genres of music in mid-seventeenth-century France. Viols are mostly used in consorts, either in broken consorts with violins, or in pure viol consorts. By contrast, the title suggests a *hautbois*-consort, or related instruments such as *cromornes*, *sacqueboutes* and *hautbois de Poitou*.

The sprinkle of figures in the bass part mentioned earlier (in three of the pieces transmitted in two parts in the Bauyn manuscript) suggests performance by a solo instrument, especially a treble viol, and a basso continuo. But as Mary Cyr argues in the introduction, it is more likely that these figures are hints for the *parties de remplissage*, to be realized *ad libitum* in performances.

All nine pieces are through composed; much of their impact is due to numerous changes of metre, often in quick time. This leads to the question of a possible proportional relationship between duplex metres and duplex to triple metre, which is varied in Couperin's time as the editor explains in her detailed introduction. Some of the pieces have characteristic dance rhythms, but none name any specific dance figure in their titles. There are few slurs in the manuscripts and just few cases of notated ornaments such as a trill.

This new edition of the extant works by Louis Couperin for string or wind instruments is thoughtfully made and finally makes available for performers these little known instrumental pieces. Her introduction, with its very informative footnotes, records their context in contemporary music as well as

discussing their style and texture. Further she gives a short, well-organised bibliography, which also mentions recordings. The editorial work makes decisions clear for both performers and scholars. The original bass figures are shown, together with a possible realisation of the *parties de remplissage* by the editor. The score layout is very clear, spacious and easy to read. The clefs are adjusted to modern clefs. Also the separate parts have a very clear layout and are practical for performance. All in all this is a very successful and informative edition of lesser known repertoire of early French viol consort music.

Pia Pircher

## LETTER CONCERNING CONTENT

[Received from the Administrator.] Re. the Journal. Rather than deeply academic contributions of a musicological nature I would like to read those of a more practical interest. Maybe by pro players, teachers and makers dealing with various self-learning approaches, various design issues (what is a division viol, what is a Pardessus) construction and maintenance of viols (dealing with gut strings etc). The Journal seems to make the assumption that readers are long established experienced players.

David A Silverstone, Glesyn, St Dominick, Saltash PL12 6TU

[Editor: When *Chelys*, the fore-runner of this *Journal*, was launched in 1969 the first Editorial noted 'In the future musicological material will appear in this journal.' The expansion of the Society's Newsletter *The Viol* means there have been numerous articles there more in keeping with the topics requested by Mr Silverstone. However, I do not commission articles and content depends on what is submitted to me. There is and will be no attempt to limit the subject, other than ensuring it's relevance to viols.]

## NOTES ON THE CONTRIBUTORS

DAVID PINTO has played with the Jaye Consort and the English Consort of Viols, among others. His editions include some of the major chamber works of William Lawes; his investigations into sources have uncovered a major seventeenth-century collector of instrumental and vocal music, John Browne (Clerk of the Parliaments), and part of his collection in the library of Christ Church, Oxford. He also identified (within the same Aldrich Bequest there) the other comparable collection, by Sir Christopher Hatton II, patron of Orlando Gibbons, and his son Christopher 1st Baron Hatton. His playing edition of John Amner's consort anthems, released at the end of 2015, adds reconstructions of those in manuscript to those published exactly four centuries beforehand.

ANDREW ASHBEE is the current curator of the Viola da Gamba *Thematic Index of Music for Viols* and General Editor of this Journal. His principal research interests are in English Court Music 1485-1714, and music for viols, especially that of John Jenkins. He has published much on both topics in books and articles. There are signs that the second volume of his study of the music of John Jenkins: *Harmonious Musick: Suites, Aires and Vocal Music* may appear during the coming year.

PIA PIRCHER, born in Vienna, is a viol player, artist and researcher on viol music. From early childhood she developed a keen interest in the aesthetic, philosophical and cultural background of the arts, and expressivity in music, particularly on the viol. Her aim is to develop a contemporary approach to playing the instrument. Currently she is completing a doctorate in musicology and studying with Vittorio Ghielmi at the Mozarteum Salzburg. Pia has received numerous prizes and scholarships, including the first prize of the 11th Biagio-Marini-Competition, the 5th prize at the 5th Int. Viola da gamba competition, further she was finalist of the 4th Int. Competition Prince Francesco Maria Ruspoli. Pia received the annual art scholarship 2013/14 granted by the Austrian ministry of culture, the Leverhulme Postgraduate Studentship and a PRO SCIENTIA scholarship. She has participated in masterclasses with Wieland Kuijken, Paolo Pandolfo and Hille Perl, and her studies brought her to the Musikhochschule Trossingen (Lorenz Duftschmid), the Royal College of Music (Richard Boothby, Reiko Ichise) and the Mozarteum Salzburg (Vittorio Ghielmi). She has performed with ensembles including Le concert des nations, English Touring Opera, Armonico Tributo Austria, Staatskapelle Dresden, and with artists such as Dorothee Oberlinger, Hiro Kurosaki, Jordi Savall, Reinhard Goebel and Vittorio Ghielmi in venues across Europe and the Far East as both a chamber musician and soloist. Most recently, Pia performed as a soloist at the London Handel Festival, Queens Gallery/Buckingham Palace, the Cobe Collection, Styriarte Festival and Trigonale Festival, with the Wiener Sängerknaben, Reinhard Goebel and Dresdner Staatskapelle, and gave lectures at the international Biannual Conference on Baroque Music, the International Festival of Viols London, for PRO SCIENTIA and gave the speech for the graduation ceremony at Mozarteum 2014.

PETER HOLMAN is Emeritus Professor of Historical Musicology at the University of Leeds. He has wide interests in English music from about 1550 to 1850, and the history of instruments and instrumental music. He is the author of the prize-winning *Four and Twenty Fiddlers: The Violin at the English Court 1540-1690* (1993), and studies of Henry Purcell (1994), and Dowland's *Lachrimae* (1999), as well as numerous scholarly articles. His most recent book, *Life after Death: the Viola da Gamba in Britain from*

*Purcell to Dolmetsch*, was published by Boydell and Brewer in November 2010. As a performer he is director of The Parley of Instruments, the Suffolk Villages Festival and Leeds Baroque. He was awarded an MBE for services to Early Music in the New Year's Honours, 2015